Deoband aur Bareli ke Ikhtilaf wa Niza‘ pur:

Fayslah Kun Munazarah

The Decisive Debate: On the Deobandi and Barelwi Conflict

A thorough refutation of false allegations made against the scholars of Deoband in **Husam al-Haramayn**

Mawlana Muhammad Manzur Nu‘mani
(1905-1997)

Translated by
MUFTI ZAMEELUR RAHMAAN

PUBLISHED BY
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.
PO BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
SOUTH AFRICA

Deoband aur Bareli ke Ikhtilaf wa Niza‘ pur:

Fayslah Kun Munazarah

The Decisive Debate:
On the Deobandi and Barelwi Conflict

A thorough refutation of false allegations made against the scholars of Deoband in Husam al-Haramayn

Mawlana Muhammad Manzur Nu‘mani
(1905-1997)

Translated by

MUFTI ZAMEELUR RAHMAAN

PUBLISHED BY
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.
PO BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
SOUTH AFRICA

Note by the Translator

Fayslah Kun Munazarah, first printed in 1933 CE, in the Urdu language, is a thorough rebuttal of the verdicts of *kufr* issued against four senior Ulama of the Deobandi School. The baseless, slanderous fatwa of *kufr* was presented in the book, *Husam al-Haramayn* of Molvi Ahmad Rida Khan Barelwi. Sufficient details about the book are given in the author's introduction. Due to the paucity of information on the subject in the English language, many Muslims in the English-speaking world were easily swayed towards the fallacious view propounded in *Husam al-Haramayn* due to the vigour with which the fatwa is propagated by its English-speaking proponents and the gravity of the allegations made. The book translated here provides a balanced, level-headed, point-by-point critique of the fatwa, demonstrating with complete clarity the deception of the original accusations against the Deobandi elders and their innocence from the heresies ascribed to them.

Sincere readers who have been exposed to the allegations will now have the opportunity to assess the validity of such claims. Allah, Most Exalted, commands in the Glorious Qur'an:

"O you who believe, if a faasiq brings you a report, verify its correctness, lest you should harm a people out of ignorance, and then become remorseful of what you had done." (49:6)

Born in 1323 H/1905 CE, the author of the book, Mawlana Muhammad Manzur Ahmad Nu'mani (Rahmatullah alayh), graduated from India's leading Islamic seminary, Dar al-'Ulum Deoband, in the year 1346 H/1927 CE. At the Madrasah, he studied under such luminaries as Imam al-'Asr 'Allamah Anwar Shah al-Kashmiri and other major Ulama of Hadith and Fiqh from the Indian subcontinent. Upon graduating, he returned to his hometown of Sunbhul and began serving the Muslim community there.

In the period following his studies, he was also actively engaged in debates against various groups, particularly the Barelwi group which had instigated a tragic *fitnah* of *takfir* that had spread throughout India. With meticulous research and lucid speech, he composed many comprehensive works related to these groups, the work translated here being one of them. Within a few years of graduating from Deoband, he also established a monthly journal, *al-Furqan*, which gained wide popularity. His pledge in the spiritual path was to Shaykh 'Abd al-Qadir Raipuri (1295 – 1382 H). He passed away in the year 1417 H/ 1997 CE. He authored a number of works on hadith, tasawwuf, politics and other topics, and he left behind a lasting legacy in the field of *da'wah* and *tabligh*.

Zameelur Rahman

Contents

In Allah's Name, the All-Merciful, the Beneficent

The Barelwi *Fitnah* of *Tafkir*: Past and Present

In this world, some events are so inexplicable, strange and beyond reason that even if the intellect racks its head a thousand times, it will still be unable to offer a rational explanation for its comprehension. The general treatment of the noble Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and their call to the Deen by their peoples is from amongst such events of this world that are inexplicable, strange and beyond reason. The Originator of the world, its Administrator, Creator -Rabbul Aalameen -, Himself, expressed "anguish" over this in such mystifying terms: *"Ah, the anguish for the bondsmen! Never came there unto them a Messenger but they did mock him!" (Qur'an 36:30)*

By way of example, the biography of the Seal of the Ambiya, our Master, Hazrat Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), as presented in the Hadith and Siyar literature, can be viewed in the backdrop of the following events of his life:

He was born in the glorious City of Makkah, where he grew up. From childhood, in appearance he was attractive and adorable, and in moral character, he

was impeccable. This is why everyone loved and respected him. He was the beloved of the entire nation and the light of their eyes. Then, at age of forty, Allah Ta'ala granted him, along with this adorable appearance and impeccable character, the perfection of Nubuwwat and the magnificence and beauty of Risaalat (Messengership). Thereafter his conduct and character became even more adorable and glittering. The fountain of knowledge and wisdom began to spring forth from his tongue, and along with the beautiful and handsome face given to him at birth, now the light of Nubuwwat also radiated from him.

Then Allah Ta'ala commanded him to call people to Tawhid and Islam. With full sincerity, complete devotion and profound wisdom, full of pain and burning, with such a voice that even a stone cannot remain impervious, he presented the call of Tawhid and Islam before his people. The truth, rationality and mercy with which he called his people were conspicuously evident. The verdict of the intellect and the requirement of reason were that the people who were previously his ardent admirers and believed and proclaimed him to be truthful and trustworthy, would with one voice say to this invitation of the Deen: "We accept," and like moths, would fall on him, and there would be no denier or opponent visible in Makkah. But what in fact

happened was that besides a few numerically insignificant loyal followers, his entire nation, who would always refer to him as 'The Honest One', 'The Truthful One' and handed to him the flower of respect, were unanimous in rejecting and opposing him.

They called him a mad poet and lying magician, and they made it their most desirable pastime to stoke the fire of hatred and enmity against him. Thereafter, for approximately ten years, those who knew and recognised him committed such injustice against him and such despicable crimes that he himself stated: "No one has been persecuted in [the path of] Allah as much as I have been persecuted."

The thinking mind is perplexed: How could this have happened?! No one can say that in those days in Makkah there existed a particular ideology which corrupted minds of men, making them mad, due to which the entire nation became insane and it was this insanity that drove them to do what they did with him. *(Indeed, it was the insanity of shirk – of worshipping idols and devouring carrion – Mujlisul Ulama)*

Take a second example from this Ummah:

The four pious predecessors, Hazrat Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, Hazrat 'Umar al-Faruq, Hazrat 'Uthman al-

Ghani and Hazrat ‘Ali al-Murtada (Radhiyallahu anhum), were great and devoted Companions of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Those who possess any knowledge of the history of Islam and the Messenger of Islam (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) know that along with Allah and His Messenger, and along with their glorious Deen, the trustworthiness and sincerity of these pious predecessors were beyond all question and doubt. The numerous sacrifices of these truthful slaves of Allah Ta’ala and these loyal devotees of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for Islam, and the many services they rendered for the Deen of Allah in the time of the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and after him, are brighter than the sun and more established and more reliable than the most well-attested and established events in the history of the world.

Furthermore, because of the abundant recurrence of the reports (*tawatur*) of the many instances in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) recognised the services and sacrifices in particular of these four devotees with love and appreciation, and repeatedly gave testimony and glad tidings of their acceptance and their companionship with him in Jannat, it (i.e. this recognition by Nabi-e-Kareem – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is almost as decisive and incontrovertible just as belief in Tawhid, the Resurrection, Fasting, Hajj and Zakah is

undoubtedly and definitively the teaching of the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

But ponder over the history of this Ummah, at the bewildering, staggering and incomprehensible event that occurred right from the inception of Islam, when groups originated from amongst the Muslims themselves whose distinction was to deny the faith of these exceptional and distinguished Companions of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and to call them (i.e. the Sahaabah), Allah forbid!, disbelievers (kuffaar), hypocrites (munaafiqeen) and deserving of execution. And till today, these sects are present in the world. *(This is a reference to the Shiah).*

Who does not know that the salient feature of the Shi'ah is to oppose and revile, in particular, Hazrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu), Hazrat 'Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hazrat 'Uthman (Radhiyallahu anhu), and to deny that they were sincere believers. In fact this vilification and denial may as well be the foundation and symbol of their religion? In this matter, their extremism and madness reached such a level that many of the educated elite from them in this era of "enlightenment", "education" and "tolerance" are not ashamed of proclaiming their intolerance when even others praise and venerate those pious

personalities. On the contrary, disowning and disassociating themselves from these pure souls is their most favourite pastime and is an act of reward according to them. This intransigent attitude defies reason.

If irrational argumentation and crookedness of heart are discarded, and if one reflects rationally without bias, can there be any rational explanation for this abhorrent manner of treating these people (i.e. the Sahaabah)?

Who can say that all members of this religious sect, the Shiah, were mad and devoid of intellect? The reality is that there are very educated men amongst them and learned scholars, and at least some intelligent and discerning ones existed in every age, and are present even today. In fact, the sanity of those distinguished scholars and writers of this religion who wrote voluminous books specifically on this topic – i.e. of attacking and vilifying the three Khulafa – is testified by those books themselves. The books bear testimony to their knowledge and awareness. Rather, this inexplicable attitude of even the intelligent Shiahs is a practical illustration of the Qur'aanic aayat

"Allah has let him go astray, despite having knowledge." (45:23)

Hidaayat is from only Allah Ta’ala.

The same is the condition of their original nemeses and adversaries, the Khawaarij and Nawaasib. According to these wretched groups, our master, Hazrat ‘Ali (Karramallaahu wajhah) was, Allah forbid!, so irreligious, and such a great enemy of Islam and a criminal worthy of execution, that his murder was not only deserving of reward, but his killer would most certainly gain Jannat. Historians have written that when the wretched Ibn Muljim stabbed our master, Hazrat ‘Ali (Karramallahu wajh) with his sword, and he realised the thrust was complete and he was successful in his mission of ending the life of the noble master, despite being arrested, he said: “I have attained success, by the Lord of the Ka‘bah!” The intent of this wretched one was that in spilling the blood of Hazrat ‘Ali and extinguishing the candle of his life, this was a sufficient price for his salvation and paradise, and whatever happens to him in this life, this act will certainly deliver him to paradise in the eternal life after death.

Tell me! What can intelligence offer in explanation for this deviance and confused mind? Historically, those people who are aware of Ibn Muljim and his sect, know that even this deviant sect was not full of madmen and ignorant people, rather there were

many distinguished, knowledgeable and intelligent people amongst them.

The truth is that in any matter, whenever any person, under the influence of the love of wealth or the love of fame or any other misguided desire or ideology, instead of the guidance of Allah, chooses his own opinions of desire and passion, then generally sound understanding given by Allah to every human being will be snatched away. Then, despite an outward appearance of a rational mind, he commits such actions which defy rational comprehension. The Qur'an describes such people as:

"They have hearts wherewith they do not understand, eyes wherewith they do not see, and ears wherewith they do not hear. They are like cattle. Rather, they are much more astray." (7:179)

Intellect-defying deviance like this can be found in abundance in the later periods of Islam also. With grief and rage, Taj al-Din al-Subki wrote in *Tabaqat al-Shafi'iyyah al-Kubra*: "There is no imaam who was speared venomous criticism and vilification." In this age, the sorrow and pain caused by narrating something about this phenomenon is also one link in this chain (of grief expressed by Subki).

The full knowledge of the realities is with Allah Almighty. However, it can be said without fear of contradiction, that after Hazrat Shah Waliullaah (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hazrat Shah 'Abd al-'Aziz (Rahmatullah alayh) in the thirteenth century Hijri (the nineteenth century CE), Hazrat Shah Isma'il Shahid (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hazrat Sayyid Ahmad Shahid (Rahmatullah alayh) and their associates were among the elite bondsmen of Allah Ta'ala. They made outstanding effort and sacrifices to protect the Deen of Islam and ultimately in the Battle of Balakot they sacrificed their lives in this path. Their efforts and sacrifices exercised a profound effect on the Muslims of India. Thus, there occurred a religious revival in the country. Piety, consciousness of Allah Ta'ala, the spirit of jihad and adherence to the Sunnah took on a new life in this country.

Then in the next period, i.e. the end of the thirteenth century and beginning of the fourteenth century, Allah Ta'ala granted success to the intellectual and spiritual inheritors of these warriors of the Deen and reformers of the nation, Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hazrat Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) and their close companions, to preserve and serve His sacred Deen in this country, and to spread Tawhid, Sunnah and Islamic

teachings in general by their sterling efforts by means of knowledge, deed, devotion and complete annihilation (*fanaiyyat ki jami'iyyat*).

Those who had seen these noble personalities, have no doubt in their hearts that these illustrious Souls in this age were from the elite slaves of Allah Azza Wa Jal Who had chosen them to serve His Deen and to spread Tawhid and Sunnah.

The heritage of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his righteous Khulafa was passed on to these slaves of the Allah Ta'ala. Thus, as the Khulafa-e-Rashideen were targeted for vilification, in this time too, such people emerged who made it their life's mission to revile and vilify these revered personalities by levelling false accusations and slander at them in the nefarious bid to turn the Muslims against them.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the person who had the greatest share and who can be described in terms of the Qur'anic phrase as, *"the one who took on himself the lead among them" (24:11)* in fabricating fatwas, stirring mischief and concocting slanders against these fighters in Allah's path, the protectors of the Sunnah and Shari'ah and reformers of the nation, was Mawlawi Ahmad Rida

Khan Sahib of Bareli. His *takfir*-mongering had become proverbial.

In his early period, Khan Sahib made Hazrat Shah Isma'il Shahid (Rahmatullah alayh) his target for attacks and *takfir*, and in his fatwas and treatises he attributed such filthy and revolting beliefs to him which a believing soul trembles to even quote. For many years, it remained his preoccupation to work against this great personality. In each treatise and fatwa, in attempting to prove dozens upon dozens of ways in which this martyr in the path of Allah Ta'ala was a 'kaafir', he demonstrated his eagerness and recklessness for *takfir*.

Then he selected as the target for his takfir, the intellectual and spiritual inheritors of the Waliullah Family, Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hazrat Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh), and others from the elders of the group of Deoband. He filled his life with vilification and *takfir* of these senior Ulama and Auliya, and he continued to offer this commodity (of takfir) for adding to his "good rewards" and "elevating" his rank.

In 1320 Hijri, in his book *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad*, he charged these revered and noble personalities with the blasphemous crimes of denial of the finality

of Nubuwwat, ascribing lies to Allah Azza Wa Jal and diminishing and debasing Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He declared them confirmed disbelievers. But since his fatwa and *takfir*-mongering were so notorious and monotonous, it had no effect on the vast majority of Muslims. The great Ulama whom he had targeted with his *takfir* simply ignored his drivel.

Seeing this reaction to his fatwa, Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib hatched a new plan: In 1323 Hijri, he composed a fatwa declaring those great scholars disbelievers. In his fatwa he attributed to them such clear disbeliefs as those mentioned above. He declared that if anybody believes them to be Muslims or even doubts that they are disbelievers, he is also definitely a disbeliever and outside the fold of Islam and will be inmates of Hell. Taking this purely fabricated and slanderous document of *takfir*, Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib in that very year went to Hijaz, and when he met the revered Ulama and Muftis of the glorious City of Makkah and the Holy City of Madinah, he informed those noble Ulama with total deviousness and scheming with the undermentioned blatant falsehood [as paraphrased from the introduction to his *Husam al-Haramayn*] that:

In Hindustan, a very difficult time has dawned on the Muslims. There are people arising amongst the Muslims with such-and-such heretical beliefs, and they have influenced the Muslim masses. We "the forlorn ones" are engaged in an attempt to end this *fitnah* but in this important task we are in need of your support by gaining your endorsements for the fatwa of *takfir* against those heretics because you are inhabitants of the Holy land of Allah and the pure city of the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and because in religious leadership we Muslims in Hindustan have full reliance on you. Thus by means of your endorsements of this fatwa, the Muslim masses of India can be saved from this disbelief and heresy. Otherwise, the *fitnah* is so immense that there is fear that their faith will be lost. So, help, help, O Steeds of Allah! Aid, aid, O Knights of the Army of the Messenger of Allah![1]

1

The fatwa which Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib presented before the scholars of the two Harams, he later printed and published under the name *Husam al-Haramayn*. This paragraph is the upshot and summary of its introduction. From simple shedding of tears and small sighs, there is a cunning art to influencing the pious and simple slaves of Allah, and the introduction to Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib's *Husam al-Haramayn* is a unique example of this. I only wrote the upshot and summary of his words. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

The Ulama of the two Harams were completely unaware of the background. They had no knowledge of the Urdu language, hence were unable to make a true assessment by reading those books of the senior Ulama of Deoband to which Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib attributed denial of the finality of Nubuwwat and other heretical beliefs. Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib deceitfully presented his fabricated fatwa of falsehood and slander. He beguiled the Ulama of the Haramain to believe that the Imaan of the Muslims of Hindustan was reliant on this fatwa and the signatures of approval from the Ulama of the two Harams. He laboured to create the impression that if their fatwa of support is not forthcoming, the Muslims of India will becomes apostates. We seek protection in Allah, and there is no power and no might except with Allah.

Many pure-hearted Ulama of the glorious City of Makkah and the Holy City of Madinah believed all the false statements and slanders of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib to be true. Just as he had hoped, they wrote with full religious zeal, endorsements on those fatwas of kufr. However, some people of Deeni insight were in doubt, hence

exercised caution in this matter. Thus they were saved from entanglement in this unsavoury affair.[2]

COMMENT BY THE MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.

The honourable Ulama of the Haramain Shareefain who were conned, tricked and induced to swallow the blasphemous slanders of the Bid'ati Ridha Khan on the basis of which they had endorsed his wholesale lies and slanders, acted most imprudently and impropriety, to say the least. Despite the simplicity which they demonstrated, due to the purity of their hearts which precluded suspicion, it was not expected of senior Ulama and Muftis to have endorsed the villainy of the Bid'ati without firstly instituting an investigation.

They were not dealing with an issue of academic import or answering an *istifta'* of hypothetical nature, or dealing with a technical issue, or answering a personal question affecting only the one who posed the issue. They at least did understand that they were called on by an unknown character hailing from Hindustan seeking the excommunication from Islam of an entire Jamaat of Ulama. They should have understood that they were dealing with a huge segment of the Ummah of Islam. Here they were called on by an entity completely unknown to them, to endorse the *takfeer* of a Jamaat of Ulama. They grievously failed to institute investigations, and terribly wronged a Jamaat of the Haqq who were undoubtedly the most outstanding Heirs of

[2] For full details, see the treatise *al-Shihab al-Thaqib* by Shaykh al-Islam Mawlana Husayn Ahmad Madani (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Torch-Bearers of the Sunnah during that era.

The honourable Ulama of Haramain Shareefain had acted unjustly. Although they had later retracted their endorsement and glowingly praised the Ulama of Deoband right into the seventh Heaven and into Jannatul Firdaus, they had initially provided the Qabar Pujaari Bid'atis with fuel to further fan the flames of their furnace of takfeer. *(End of our comment –Mujlisul Ulama of S.A.)*

In short, this fabricated fatwa, which was based purely on falsehood and slanderous accusations, was published in Hindustan under the name of *Husam al-Haramayn*, and it created an uproar. It was conveyed to the masses that even the Ulama and Muftis of the Haramain Shareefain had issued the fatwa of kufr against the famous and noble Ulama and illustrious Akabireen of the Jamaat of Deoband, viz. Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh), Hazrat Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh), Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib Saharanpuri (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh).

According to the fatwa the kufr of these senior Ulama was so emphatic that whoever doubted that they are disbelievers and inmates of Hell, he too is a disbeliever and from the inhabitants of Hell.

There is no doubt that this devious antic of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib created a storm of *fitnah* for the Muslims of Hindustan. Probably thousands or millions of simple-hearted Muslims who were earlier completely unaffected by the kufr

fatwa-mongering of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib, became afflicted by this *fitnah* because of the names of the Ulama of the two Harams.

When our elders whose entire focus at that time was concentrated on the primary engagements of preserving Islam in Hindustan, by lecturing, teaching, reforming and guiding etc. and who had hitherto remained unconcerned about the *takfiri* occupation of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib, saw that Allah's slaves were being deceived by the names of the Ulama of the two Harams, and because of this deception those poor souls were afflicted by *fitnah*, even these honourable Ulama of Deoband believed that it was necessary to remove the veil to uncover the true reality of this deception. Thus, from the four great personalities to whom heretical beliefs were ascribed and were thus ruled to be disbelievers, the two scholars whose light at the time still shone on this earth, Hakim al-Ummah Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Sahib Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayjh) and Makhdum al-Millah Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib Saharanpuri (Rahmatullah alayh), presented their explanations in which they established their innocence by dissociating from those heretical beliefs so slanderously ascribed to them. They further emphasized with clarity that those beliefs which Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib ascribed to them in *Husam al-Haramayn* are pure slanders against them, and those who have these beliefs are disbelievers even according to them.

The explanations of these Scholars were published at that time in such treatises as *al-Sahab al-Midrar*, *Qat' al-Watin* and others. The explanation of Hazrat Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh) was

published in the form of a brief and independent treatise called *Bast al-Banaan*.

At that time, it also happened that after Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib returned from Hijaz, a discussion on this issue was generated in the two noble Harams, particularly in Madinah Munawwarah. It dawned on the honourable Ulama that the beliefs of the Ulama of Deoband against whom the (Bid'ati) had secured endorsement for his fatwa of kufr, were explained inaccurately. Thus, some of these noble Ulama felt it was necessary to correspond with the Ulama of Deoband to clarify and verify the matter. Thus, keeping in view whatever Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib wrote in *Husam al-Haramayn* in relation to those revered personalities and whatever he said to them directly to create hatred and animosity against them in the hearts of the Ulama of the two Harams, they composed 26 questions for the Ulama of Deoband, and requested their answers.

All the questions were related to the beliefs and methodology of the Ulama of Deoband. Thereupon, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib Saharanpuri (Rahmatullah alayh) wrote a comprehensive reply which was endorsed by almost all the senior and famous Ulama of Deoband. This response was sent to the Ulama and Muftis of the Haramain Shareefain and also to Egypt, Levant and other Islamic countries. All of them wrote their concurrence in support of it, and they stated that these are the beliefs of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah, and that there was nothing in the Response against the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah.

All these questions, answers and the endorsements of the noble Ulama of Hindustan, of the Haramain Shareefain and of other Islamic countries, have been published with its Urdu translation in the form of a large treatise called *al-Tasdiqat li Daf‘ al-Talbisat*. This treatise has been reprinted several times. The reality is that for sincere seekers of truth, only this treatise was sufficient, and even now it is still adequate.

Besides this, from the students and servants of those senior personalities, Hazrat Mawlana Sayyid Husayn Ahmad Sahib Madani and Hazrat Mawlana Sayyid Murtaza Hasan Sahib Chandpuri who at that time were from the young scholars and learned graduates of Deoband, wrote in response to the fabricated fatwa of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib, *al-Sahab al-Midraar*, *al-Shihaab al-Thaaqib*, *Tazkiyat al-Khawaatir*, *Tawdih al-Bayaan, etc.*, in which they exposed with complete detail and clarity the various inaccuracies, distortions and deceptions of Khan Sahib of Bareli regarding the statements of Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh), Hazrat Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh), Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib Saharanpuri (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf ‘Ali Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh).

These treatises gave further clarity to this matter, and it was as though the matter was closed. However, on behalf of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib, the task of *takfir* and causing division continued in the same fashion. But after those answers, no life remained in it, and its market lost value.

Then in 1345-6 Hijri (1926-7 CE), that is, about 20 years after the first publication of *Husam al-Haramayn*, the successors of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Shaib again, with clamour and ruckus, raised this *fitnah*. Then through the means of fatwa-mongering, open challenges and advertisements to attempt to cause a growth in their market (of kufr, bid'ah and dhalaal), I say with sadness and grief, the poor Muslim masses were again exposed to it, and due to their ignorance of Deen and fickleness, they again became the targets of *fitnah*. Such ignorant people who do not even know the pronouncement of faith (*la ilaha illallah*), having been affected by those *fitnah*-instigators, began to call those great Ulamas of the Deen disbelievers, believing it to be an act of reward. Houses became battlegrounds, and even the mosques and 'Id musallas were made places of war.

In that year (1345-6 Hijri), this helpless writer, was completing his final year (*dawrah hadith*) in Dar al-'Ulum Deoband. It was either good fortune or bad fortune that in my hometown and its neighbouring areas the flares of this *fitnah* were very intense. It was a combination of circumstances and the eagerness of youth which impelled me to turn my efforts to the endeavour to extinguish this fire of fitnah. I resolved to oppose and fight those who kindled it till the very end, and to decisively settle the matter. Then for about ten years, along with my other activities of lecturing, writing etc., I was also keenly engaged in this occupation. Here, with humility it is best for me to mention that I spared no effort in attending all the places where the need was realised and I debated the flag bearers of *takfir*. In refutation of their claims I wrote approximately 40 to 50 small and large

treatises, 21 years ago, in 1353 Hijri. The special subject in the monthly *al-Furqan* at that time was fighting this *fitnah*.

But it was 3 to 4 years after the commencement of *al-Furqan*, in 1354 Hijri/1937 CE, that it came to my attention that there was a big change happening in Hindustan. It demanded that I devote all my efforts towards serving Islam by creating Islamic awareness and steadfastness in adherence to Islam in those groups of Muslims whose attachment to Islam was deficient. This feeling overwhelmed my heart and mind to such an extent that within a few days all other activities lost their appeal. Thus, I made this project my sole work, to such a degree that in refutation of the *fitnah* of *takfir* from Bareli some very important books had been written. However, due to circumstances these books were not printed and the manuscripts were lost.

The impending revolution in India which this helpless one sensed in 1937 CE and concern for the consequences thereof, came exactly ten years later, in 1947 with such massive upheavals and trials which the greatest futurists could not have predicted. Pain is felt in even the memory of the suffering which afflicted the Muslims in this revolution of Hindustan. But it was hoped that from this evil, good will emerge, that is, some sense will return to the Muslim masses of Hindustan, and that those who could make Deeni and worldly improvements for them will be engaged in constructive works, while deluded persons will not be able to continue their misguidance. It was hoped that the *fitnah* of *takfir* from Bareli like any *fitnah* will now begin to subside. But how wrong was this thought!

It was realised that despite this frightful, horror-filled revolution most Muslims did not take heed, and no improvement came about in them regarding their gain or loss, advantage or disadvantage. In those situations where some semblance of tranquillity was created, all the destructive activities, idiocies and stupidities were again kindled. When the circumstances of Hindustan became somewhat milder, the efforts of the flag bearers of this *fitnah* of *takfir* from Bareli to cause division and create corruption again kindled this *fitnah* in many areas.

For about two to two and half years, the situation was such that the days were rare when letters from various parts of the country did not come to me regarding this *fitnah* and corruption. In these letters, it was generally written that "from the Barelwi group, so-and-so famous *mukaffir* Mawlawi Sahib has come here and his speeches have created a storm." *(Mukaffir: one who makes takfir of people).* As a consequence, a battleground and warzone have been created amongst the Muslims."

The practice of *takfir* has been spread amongst the laypeople. By peddling lies and slanders against the groups in Hindustan doing Deeni work, particularly Jam'iyat al-'Ulama and Tablighi Jama'at, they have created hatred in the Muslim masses. Their ignorant listeners raise their hands to pledge opposition to those Deeni groups. Thus, great obstacles have been placed in the path of the work we are doing to bring about adherence to Deen amongst the Muslims masses.

For about two and half years such letters continued to come to me from different parts of the country, and in almost every letter there was a demand that, in order to save Muslims from this evil

fitnah and in order to answer the slanders of those fabricators, to reply immediately and to send the books which I had written of mine in this regard.

However, most of my books on this topic were unavailable. Allah Ta'ala imbued my heart with the understanding that after my own moral reformation, my time and efforts would be best and most valuably spent, especially in this time when there is a secret plot, nay open efforts, to eradicate the Imaan of the Muslims masses, in the primary and foundational works to create Deeni realisation, Imaani fervour and an Islamic life in the masses of the Muslim Ummah. This is the great Jihad of this time.

Besides, in my earlier phase, after ten years of experience, it became a "true certainty" (Qur'an 69:51) for me that the educated flag bearers and leaders of this *fitnah* of *takfir* never misunderstood or made an academic slip. They themselves know very well that our elders are completely innocent of the heretical beliefs they attribute to them. In short, I do not have even an atom's weight of doubt in this ungodliness. Purely for the achievement of their worldly benefits and interests, do they wilfully slander and falsely accuse our elders. Therefore, there is no hope that even if they understand the matter from what we write or lecture that this *fitnah* will end. Not only once or twice, again and again, by means of writing, lecturing and discussion, attempts have been made to make them understand. Books have been written. Debates have been organized.

By the grace and mercy of Allah Almighty in those books and in the debates, the matter was composed and written in such a way

that if in reality there was some misunderstanding or academic error then this matter would have ended long ago. But the reality is that, since this *fitnah*-mongering is the means of their livelihood, even if they are made to understand a thousand times, they will never accept. Their condition is exactly like the stubborn actions of those who oppose Allah. Regarding them the Noble Qur'an says: ***"And they denied them, though their souls acknowledged them, because of spite and arrogance." (27:14)***

This is why I am certain that talking with these instigators of fitnah with a view to make them understand, is merely a waste of time and actually helps their cause. This is why it is my firm opinion that all of this should be avoided, and the policy mentioned in these words of the Qur'an should be adopted clearly: ***"There is no argumentation between us and you. Allah will bring us together, and to Him is the final return." (42:15)***

Thus, I will no longer correspond with the flag bearers and leaders of this *fitnah* of *takfir* who have made this *fitnah*-mongering their profession and occupation. However, it is no doubt the right of those poor Muslim laymen who, being deceived by their 'scholarly' appearance and 'scholarly' dress, became afflicted by this *fitnah* of *takfir*, that in a suitable manner they should be made to understand. An attempt should be made to save them from this cauldron of *fitnah*.

In this respect, a grassroots and general method is that wherever this *fitnah* is manifest, the actual truth and the reality of these *fitnah*-creators should be explained to the educated Muslims amongst them. They will in turn attempt to make the masses understand. Furthermore, it is necessary to hold gatherings

specifically for this purpose and respected Ulama who are aware of the reality of this *fitnah* and the *fitnah*-mongers should deliver lectures.

It is also required that in this respect some books are published in which an adequate rebuttal is given to the slanders of those impious fabricators against the elder and senior Ulama, with complete verification and detail, politely and in simple language. From these books every literate seeker of truth will know the truth and can make others understand it. All praise to Allah, for this objective, there is absolutely no need to write or prepare a new book. As was mentioned above, the work that was done in the first period is sufficient and adequate for all times. The need is only that in this regard arrangements are made to reprint those important and beneficial books which were lost by the passage of time.

Although such work is now very burdensome to my temperament, but for two and a half years those letters that have continued coming to me from different parts of the country regarding this fitnah, have forced this helpless one to at least commit to preparing the final answer which this helpless one wrote, and which I named *Ma'rikat al-Qalam,* 21 years ago[3] in response to *Husam al-Haramayn* of Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib, the subtitle or second title of which was *Fayslah Kun Munazarah* which has been unavailable for around 20 years.

Besides this, about 19 or 20 years ago, I wrote several articles in response to the *fitnah* of those who charge Hazrat Shah Isma'il

---

[3] That is, in the year 1352 H/1933 CE.

Shahid (Rahmatullah alayh) with kufr by accusing him of revolting and impure slanders. Each article was like an independent treatise. All these articles were also lost. Now when the need was felt to reprint them and attempts were made, with the help of Allah Ta'ala, all these articles have been received and having revised them, I have prepared them for printing by arranging them in the form of a separate book.

With the grace of the Almighty, I hope these two treatises will suffice to answer the slanders which the general *mukaffirin (the kufr mongers)* of the Barelwi group monotonously repeat more frequently regarding our elders, and on which they base their *takfir*. The preparation of these two treatises has been delegated to a dear friend. The dear friend has intentions to see them printed. Insha-Allah, it is hoped that within two or three months both treatises will be ready.

Concerned ones from different parts of the country who are worried by the disturbance of this *fitnah* of *takfir* from Bareli wrote to this helpless one and insisted that I again turn my attention to this direction. I informed them that in my present circumstances and obligations, this helpless one feels that to save the general Muslims from the evil of this *fitnah* in this time, it is only binding on him to present to them these pages regarding his opinion, advice and experience, and to prepare those two books which he believes are necessary to publish, and for which he gives permission to those who wish to print it.

More than this, I am not capable of. O Allah! Give us the ability to do what You love and what You are pleased with, and make our succeeding condition better than our preceding condition.

Introduction and Apology

Before readers study this treatise, *Fayslah Kun Munazarah*, which was originally a detailed reply and rebuttal of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's fatwa, *Husaam al-Haramayn*, it is necessary to explain its fascinating history and unique nature.

This is now a 21 to 22 year old story:

In Shawwal of 1352 Hijri, a unique debate was registered to take place in Lahore on the contents of *Husaam al-Haramyn*. The most important aspect of this debate was that the representatives of the two sides who were nominated on behalf of each party to agree on the initial principles, also proposed as arbitrators three extremely important and distinguished personalities in order to make this a decisive debate: first, the deceased Dr. 'Allamah Sir Muhammad Iqbal; second, the deceased 'Allamah Asghar 'Ali Sahib Ruhi (Professor at Islamiyyah College, Lahore); and third, Shaykh Sadiq Hasan Sahib B.L. (Amritsar). The three revered personalities accepted the invitation to be arbitrators.

The reality was that this was the first time in the entire history of the *fitnah* of *takfir* from Bareli that the representatives of the Barelwis accepted the principles of arbitration to decide this debate, and

they even agreed on the abovementioned three personalities. I understood this as a great advantage, and I decided that in any circumstance, this debate must happen. In this debate, the responsibility of proving this fatwa of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, *Husaam al-Haramayn*, wrong and baseless and that it is based on forgery and slander, was given by the representatives of the Deobandi group to the writer of these lines [i.e. Mawlana Manzur Nu�start mani]. I wrote down my research on *Husaam al-Haramayn* and that which I was going to say in front of the arbitrators in my opening speech, with the view to giving one copy at the time to the arbitrators and one copy to the opposition.

However, the outcome of the debate was that when its date was near and we, the worthless writer of these lines, Muhammad Manzur Nu‘mani, the respected Mawlana Abu al-Wafa Sahib Shahajanpuri and the respected Mawlana Muhammad Isma‘il Sahib Sunbhuli, who were at this time present at most of these events to resist the *fitnah* of *takfir* from Bareli, arrived at Lahore, the Barelwi representatives foresaw their defeat, nay truthfully an end to their revolutionary *fitnah* of *takfir*, so using their traditional scheming, first they reneged from the agreement of arbitration, and after this, by means of corrupt demonstrations and deceptive

schemes, they compelled the security forces to cancel the debate.

In the end this is what happened, and despite all our efforts the debate could not take place. Since the full details of all these events were published at the time in the journal *al-Furqan*'s early instalments and the first edition of the treatise *Fayslah Kun Munazarah*, it is now unnecessary to repeat it.

When this debate could not take place in Lahore, this helpless one who wrote down his speech, published it as *Fayslah Kun Munazarah* in the first instalment of *al-Furqan* and afterwards in the form of a separate book. Since Mawlawi Hamid Raza Khan, the most senior successor and son of Janab Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, was chosen by the Barelwi group as its representative in the debate that was supposed to take place at Lahore, my speech was addressed to him, and in various places he was mentioned by name. But now, 21 to 22 years later, when the need for this refutation of *Husaam al-Haramayn* was again felt, and for this purpose I decided to revise it, I felt it was appropriate to remove this specific address and his name. If his name is still found anywhere in the treatise, understand it to be an oversight. Besides this, there were some changes to the wording. Even so, I feel it is necessary for me to submit by way of

apology to the readers that had I found the opportunity I would have changed the style and language completely, and I would have written it in a more reader-friendly way. But since the books had to be printed, and I had no time to rewrite the entire book with a new style and language, I was forced to publish it in its current form.

I pray that from the deeds and actions which are pleasing to Allah Azza Wa Jal, of those of His accepted slaves on behalf of whom a defence was made and a response was given that, a speck of it is granted to this worthless one, and by their blessing this book is made beneficial. Ameen.

Muhammad Manzur Nu‘mani (May Allah forgive him)

The False Allegation against Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Sahib Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh) of Denying the Khatm-e-Nubuwwat

On pages 12-13 of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's *Husaam al-Haramayn*, from where the *takfir* of senior scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah begins, he wrote regarding Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Sahib Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh), the founder of Dar al-'Ulum Deoband:

"Qasim al-Nanotwi, the author of *Tahzir al-Naas*, who said therein:

"If a new Nabi were supposed in his (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) time, even after him (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), that would not infringe on his Sealship (*khatamiyyah – him being the Seal of the Ambiya)*, and it is only the commoners who imagine that he (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the Seal of the Ambiya in the meaning *(of him being the)* 'last of the Ambiya' *(Chronologically speaking)* although there is no virtue in this at all according to the people of understanding"......

It says in *al-Tatimmah* and *al-Ashbah* and [other books] besides these: "When one does not

recognise that Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the last of the Ambiya, he is not a Muslim, because it is from the necessities.” (*Husaam al-Haramayn*, p. 12)

This slave [i.e. Mawlana Manzur Nu‘mani] submits that the ruling of disbelief which has been levelled at Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) in this statement of Khan Sahib Barelwi is nothing besides deception and deceit. Even this Khan Sahib is not so ignorant and dimwitted to the degree of such stupidity which ensues as a consequence of this fatwa. And Allah knows best.

Proofs of the Deception of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan

The reasons for concluding that the verdict is erroneous and pure distortion and deceit are:

First Reason

In quoting this text of *Tahzir al-Naas*, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib undertook the most sorrowful display of distortion (*tahrif*), hence this cannot be said to be a quote from *Tahzir al-Naas* in any way. The reality is that this text of *Tahzir al-Naas* was fabricated by joining separate sentences from three different pages! Thus, one sentence is from page 3, another from page 14, and another

from page 28. Apart from the different page numbers, there is no demarcation between the sentences, and as a consequence, any casual reader will not be able to understand that these are from different places; rather, he will be forced to believe that this is one contiguous quote. Moreover, it does not end here. In order to create a content of pure disbelief, Khan Sahib even changed the order of these sentences. Thus, he first wrote the sentence from page 14, and then after this, the one from page 28, and then the one from page 3.

The result of this literal miscegenation of Khan Sahib by changing the order is that if the three sentences from *Tahzir al-Naas* were read separately in their respective places, nobody would conceive of the author denying the Seal of Nubuwwat. But, in the way he quoted the statements from *Tahzir al-Naas*, denial of the Khaatme-e-Nubuwwat will clearly be understood. And this is a consequence of the handiwork of his pen. Otherwise, the author of *Tahzir al-Naas* is free from this, which, if Allah wills, shall be made completely clear in the coming explanation.

By translating these sentences from *Tahzir al-Naas* into Arabic, which he then presented before the Ulama of the two Harams, he committed even greater injustice and chicanery, and insolently

completed the fabrication. He undertook the work of editing the sentences from pages 14 and 28 in order to falsify and fabricate one sentence. Thus he deleted the subject from the first sentence on page 14 and made the subject of the second sentence on page 28 the subject of the first sentence in such a way that no one will imagine that these are statements from different places. These actions of his are called *tahrif* in the parlance of the Qur'an.

The Glorious Qur'an describes the *tahrif (interpolation and mutilation)* of the Bani Isra'il to the Tauraah in the following words: *"They distort the words from its places." (Qur'an 4:46)* This Khan Sahib himself in one place described such an action as "dangerous *tahrif*" (*khawfnaak tahrif*). Khan Sahib in his treatise *Bariq al-Manar* wrote that a person quoted the Qur'an to say *tatta khidhuna 'alayhim masajida,* which is a statement fabricated by joining three separate words of the Qur'an]. In regards to this, Khan Sahib wrote on page 17 of *Bariq al-Manar*:

"The most dangerous *tahrif* is this, that *tatta khidhuna 'alayhim masajida* has been constructed as a Qur'anic phrase, whereas this is nowhere [to be found] in the Mighty Qur'an. These three words indeed come separately in the Mighty Qur'an."

From this quote of Khan Sahib it is clearly understood that to take words from separate places of any book and join them to make one contiguous quote and then to attribute it to the author of that book is the most dangerous *tahrif*, and this type of *tahrif* changes the original meaning; and it is not farfetched that as a consequence of such *tahrif* a statement may become pure kufr.

Tahzir al-Naas is a book authored by a human being. If some wretched person desires to create a content of kufr from the speech of Allah by the employment of this type of *tahrif*, he will be able to do so, *(as was the practice of Bani Israaeel)* yet he would probably not have to undergo such strain as Khan Sahib did when selecting one sentence from page 14, and another from page 28, and another from page 3.

In one chapter of the the Qur'an-e-Hakeem, rather one verse, this type of action would change it to a content of kufr. For example, the Glorious Qur'an states: *"Verily the righteous are in bliss, and verily the wicked are in the Fire." (82:13-4)* Now, if a follower or student of Khan Sahib were to act upon the *sunnah* (practice) of Khan Sahib, and resort to this type of *tahrif* in the noble verse by replacing "bliss" with "fire" and "fire" with "bliss," the meaning will be completely altered, and the

sentence will become clear kufr whereas all words are from the Qur'an and only the two words were inter-changed to produce the opposite meaning of kufr.

This is only one example. Thousands of similar examples could be fabricated. Here, the places of words are changed. In some situations just by changing the places of vowels (*harakaat*), a meaning of disbelief will be created. For example, the Noble Qur'an says: *"Aadam disobeyed his Rabb, and erred." (20:121)* Now, if some wretched person were to change the vowels of "Aadam" and "Rabb", and place a *fathah* instead of the *dammah* on the *meem* of *aadam* and place a *dammah* instead of the *fathah* on the *ba* of R*abb,* the meaning would change to: *"His Rabb disobeyed Aadam".* This slight change will transform this originally pure speech, the reading of which is meritorious and rewardable, into pure kufr.

Anyhow, the reality is manifest that in some instances a slight distortion of a statement changes the meaning and this creates the difference between Islam and Kufr, let alone the abominable alteration that will occur by slicing sentences from different places, making them into one contiguous sentence, and even changing the order of the sentences. Since Khan Sahib gave the ruling of kufr

after making this vile *tahrif*, and since this *tahrif* and alteration of the sequence of the text from *Tahzir al-Naas* completely change the meaning and create a meaning constituting denial of the Chronological Seal of Nubuwwat, I am compelled to believe the verdict is deliberately deceptive and purposefully distorting.

Second Reason

The second reason and the second evidence for this opinion [that the passage from *Hussam al-Haramayn* is pure deceit] is that in the Arabic translation of the sentences from *Tahzir al-Naas*, Khan Sahib undertook the most despicable display of deceit, which is that the sentence on page 3 of *Tahzir al-Naas* is as follows:

"Magar ahl e fahm par roshun hoga ke taqaddum ya ta-akh-khur zamaani me bizzaat kuch fazilat nehih."

"But it will become clear to the people of intelligence that in coming earlier or later in time, there is intrinsically no virtue."

It is apparent that in this sentence only intrinsic virtue is negated, which according to the implied meaning (*mafhum al-mukhalafah*) necessitates the

affirmation of extrinsic virtue[4], but Khan Sahib made the Arabic translation as follows:

ma'a annahu la fadla fihi aslan 'inda ahl al-fahm

"Although there is no virtue in this at all according to the people of understanding..."

The meaning of which is that there is absolutely no virtue in Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being the last Nabi according to the people of understanding. This statement negates every type of virtue. However, between the two there is the difference between the earth and sky.

Third Reason

The third reason and the third evidence for this opinion is that the preceding and succeeding sections of those sentences from *Tahzir al-Naas* which Khan Sahib quoted in this passage, from which their true meaning would become clear and there would be no room for misunderstanding, were deleted. The evidence for this will come later.

[4] The principle of implied meaning is taken into consideration in the case of authors. 'Allamah Shami wrote in *Radd al-Muhtar*: "[It is written] in *Anfa' al-Wasa'il*: 'The implied meaning of a writing [besides the texts of the Shari'ah] is a proof.'" (*Radd al-Muhtar* 3:644) The famous disagreement which exists between Hanafis and Shafi'is on this subject is restricted only to the texts of the Shari'ah [and does not extend to the writings of other authors]. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

Fourth Reason

The fourth reason and the fourth evidence for this opinion are that Khan Sahib's ruling of disbelief is based solely on the notion that *Tahzir al-Naas* denies the Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, while from its beginning to end there is not a single word from which denial of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being the Seal of the Ambiya could be inferred. On the contrary, the objective of *Tahzir al-Naas* is the preservation and protection of every kind of Sealship for the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), whether essential, chronological, spatial or otherwise. And, specifically with respect to Chronological Sealship, there are absolutely clear and obvious statements in *Tahzir al-Naas*. For example on page 3, after the sentence which the Barelwi learned man quoted last, it is mentioned:

"Rather, the Khatm-e-Nubuwwat is based on another consideration by which chronological finality and closing the aforementioned door (i.e. the door of false claimants of nubuwwat) will be necessitated automatically, and excellence of Nubuwwat will be multiplied."

Likewise, on page 10 of *Tahzir al-Naas*, Mawlana Nanotwi, after completing his explanation of the primary hypothesis, writes:

"Therefore, since *Khaatamiyyat (i.e. the Seal of Nubuwwat)* is absolute and comprehensive [i.e. includes all three types of Sealship: chronological, spatial and essential[5]], Chronological Sealship is an obvious (necessary corollary). Otherwise [i.e. if only Essential Sealship is taken as the immediate meaning of "Seal"], accepting the necessity of Chronological Sealship by implication (*dalaalat iltizami*) is immediately established[6]. Here, the explicit statements of the Nabi, e.g. "You [i.e. Ali] are to me as Harun was to Musa, but there is no nabi after me," etc, which apparently is derived from the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" in the aforementioned manner[7], are sufficient in this subject, because it reaches the level of *tawatur*.

[5] For details, see Appendix A

[6] For details, see Appendix A

[7] Here it is worth noting the point that those hadiths like "there is no nabi after me" which clearly indicate Chronological Sealship, are according to Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim Sahib (Allah have mercy on him), derived from the phrase "Seal of the Prophets" from the Noble Qur'an. Meaning, it is the opinion and claim of the aforementioned Mawlana that those hadiths in which Allah's Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said he is the final Nabi and that no nabi will come after him are derived from the word "Seal of the Ambiya" from the Qur'an Shareef and are like an explanation and elaboration of it. This very clear statement from Hazrat Mawlana (Allah have mercy on him) shows the shamelessness of those who say he believes "Seal of the Ambiya" in the meaning of last nabi, is merely the opinion of the commoners. Mawlana (Allah have mercy on him) only described the restriction of its meaning to "last Nabi" as the understanding of the commoners, the explanation of which will come later. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

Furthermore, consensus (*ijma*') has been reached on this. Although the aforementioned words were not transmitted by *mutawatir* chains, there is *tawatur* in the meaning here, just like the *tawatur* of the number of *rak'ats* of the obligatory Salaat, the Witr Salaat, etc. Although the words of the narrations stating the number of *rak'at* are not *mutawatir*, the denier thereof is a disbeliever. Similarly, the one who denies this [i.e. Chronological Sealship] is a disbeliever."

In this passage, Mawlana Nanotwi confirms Chronological Sealship for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in five ways:

1. The Chronological Sealship of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is established by the complete signification (*dalala mutabiqi*)[8] of the text "Seal of the Ambiya." In this way, "Seal" is accepted as inclusive of Essential and Chronological [Sealship].

2. Or by means of the generality of the metaphor (*'umum al-majaz*)[9], the indication of the word "Seal" applies to both types of Sealship.

---

[8] A term of logic: the complete meaning for which a word or phrase was coined.

[9] A juristic and linguistic principle in which the metaphorical meaning of a certain word broadens the original linguistic meaning of the word so as to

3. Or it applies directly to one of them and indirectly to the other. In all three cases, Chronological Sealship is established from the text of the Qur'an.

4. The Chronological Sealship of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is established on the basis of the *mutawatir* Ahaadith.

5. There is Ijma' (Consensus) of the Ummah on Chronological Sealship.

After establishing Chronological Sealship of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in these five ways, Mawlana Nanotwi also stated that the denier of Chronological Sealship is a kaafir in the same way as one who denies the essentials and decisive elements of religion (i.e. *Dhurooriyaat).*

Despite such explicit and emphatic affirmation of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being the Seal of the Ambiya, in *Tahzir al-Naas*, to claim that there is denial of this fact in the kitaab, if it is not monstrous injustice and deceit, then what is it?

Furthermore, such clear statements are not found only in one or two places, but it would be difficult to miss it on nearly every page. At this juncture, I will

---

incorporate its literal meaning and any other meanings intended by the metaphor.

present only one more text from *Tahzir al-Naas* in which Mawlana Nanotwi explained Chronological *Khaatamiyyat* of Nubuwwat, using a wonderful and marvellous philosophical concept. On page 21 of *Tahzir al-Nas*, he writes:

"If time is to be considered as motion, it must also have an end-point upon which the motion ends. Thus, for the motion of the series of Nubuwwat [which is one motion within the motions of time], the point of the essence of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is its end-point. And this point is in relation to the chronological and spatial lines just as the apex of an angle [in which two lines meet and end at one point]. By this indication, the reality is known that his Nubuwwat is comprehensive of cosmos and space, earth and time."

Then after a few lines on the same page, he says:

"From amongst the motions [of time] is also the motion of the series of Nubuwwat. Thus, due to attaining the ultimate end-point, viz. the essence of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), that motion returns to rest. Definitely other motions [of time besides the motion of the series of Nubuwwat] still remain. This is also another reason for his appearance at the end of time. (*Tahzir al-Naas* p. 21)

Furthermore, this is not restricted to *Tahzir al-Naas*. Such clear statements are also found in other works of Hazrat Nanotwi. Just by way of example, note some passages from *Munazarah 'Ajibah*. At the beginning of this topic in *Munazarah 'Ajibah* begins, the first line is:

"The Chronological Sealship of the Revered Seal of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is accepted by all, and it is also accepted by all that he is the first of creation [either absolutely or relatively]."

Further, on page 39 he says:

"Chronological Sealship is my religion and faith, though certainly there is no cure for undeserved accusations."

Further, on page 50 he writes:

"I never denied Chronological Sealship. Rather, it would be more correct to say I left no room for the deniers to deny it. I believe in the Nabi's superiority, and have strengthened the foothold of those who believe in this. Moreover, I believe in the Nubuwwat of the other Ambiya, but I do not consider anyone

equal to the Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)."

On page 69 he writes:

"Yes it is accepted that Chronological Sealship is a unanimous creed."

On page 103, he writes:

"There is no possibility of another Nabi appearing after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). I consider that the one who believes such (a possibility) , is a disbeliever."

These five passages are only from *Munazarah 'Ajibah*. On page 1 of the Hazrat Nanotwi's final book *Qiblah Naamah,* he says:

"His Deen is the last of all religions, and since Deen is the name of divine decree, the one whose religion is last, he will be the chief, because only the person whose religion is last will be the master of all."

These are ten passages from the writings of Hazrat Qasim al-'Ulum (May his Soul be sanctified)[10]. Can any person of integrity and intellect say after being

[10] Mawlana Muhammad Sayf al-Rahman Qasim collected all the passages from Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi's works where he stated clearly his belief in the finality of Nubuwwat in a large work called *Hazrat Nanotwi aur Khidmat Khatm e Nubuwwat*.

apprized of these clear statements that this person (Hadhrat Maulana Nanotwi) denied the Chronological Seal of Nubuwwat? But there is no cure for fabricators. Regarding such fabricators, 'Aarif Jami (Rahmatullah alayh) said:

"This they do in jest

This they say – how evil! How farfetched!

Because of this a righteous face is made ugly

And a mended heart is broken"

The explicit statements mentioned above from the various writings of Hazrat Nanotwi, and the academic and practical efforts of other Deobandi Ulama against the Qadiyani group relating to the issue of the Seal of Nubuwwat , which to this day appear in the form of books and debates that are known and accepted in the Islamic world[11], are more than enough for a fair person to recognise the clear position of the founder of Dar- al-'Ulum Deoband and the Ulama of Deoband regarding the issue of the Seal of Nubuwwat. *"And Allah guides whomever He wishes to the straight path," (Qur'an 2:213) "And*

[11] For a list of such works, see Shaykh 'Abd al-Fattah Abu Ghuddah, *al-Tasrih bi ma Tawatara fi Nuzul al-Masih*, Dar al-Basha'ir al-Islamiyyah, Sixth Edition, 1426 H/2005 CE, pp. 49-53

those who do injustice will soon know to which place they will return." (Qur'an 26:227)

[An Explanation of the Correct Meaning of the Passages from *Tahzir al-Naas*]

It will be appropriate to present with some detail the true meaning of the three sentences of *Tahzir al-Naas* which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib sliced and joined together to slander the author, accusing him of denying the Chronological Sealship of Nubuwwat. For this it is necessary to summarise the methodology and theoretical viewpoint of Mawlana Nanotwi with regards to the exegesis of the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" (33:40) from the Qur'an[12].

Hazrat Nanotwi and the Exegesis of "the Seal of the Ambiya"

Firstly, the hypothesis is made that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) - May my soul and my heart be sacrificed for him – in reality has two types of Seals:

1. One is chronological (*zamaniyyah*), which simply means he is the last of all the Ambiya, and

[12] For a more detailed look at Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi's exegesis of this phrase, with reference to the original work and a brief look at his proofs, see Appendix A

his age came after all the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam), and no Nabi will be sent after his time.

2. The second is Essential or Intrinsic Sealship (*zaatiyyah*) which means that he embodies the attribute of Nubuwwat intrinsically, while the Nubuwwat of the other Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) is by acquisition, not inherent. In other words, Allah Azza Wa Jal granted Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) Nubuwwat directly, and to other Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) through the medium of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Just as Allah Azza Wa Jal gave light directly to the sun and its light is not gained from the light of anything else in the universe, so too did Allah Ta'ala grant the perfections of Nubuwwat directly to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), without any medium. His Nubuwwat was not acquired from the Nubuwwat of any other Nabi. And just as Allah Almighty granted the moon and other heavenly bodies light through the medium of the sun, so too did He grant the other Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) Nubuwwat through the medium of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). While those revered personalities are truly Ambiya, their Nubuwwat draws from the effusion of the Nubuwwat of Hazrat Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). And all this is with the permission of Allah Almighty.

3. And just as the series of everything that has an accidental property ends upon something that has an essential property and does not precede it. It is like light which illuminates a room by the reflected light of a mirror, and the light of the mirror can be said to be a reflection of the sun. However, this process of the series comes to an end at the sun, and no one can say that the sun's light is a reflection of the light of some other body of the universe because the sun was given light directly by Allah Almighty. Similarly, can be said in relation to the Nubuwwat of all the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). Their Nubuwwat was acquired from the Seal of Rasulullah's Nubuwwat. Since Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the Seal of this series, none can say that his Nubuwwat was acquired from any Nabi because he is the essential Nabi by the permission of Allah. This is called "Essential Seal" and this rank is called "Essential Sealship."

After this brief introduction, it should be known that the conclusion of the research of Hazrat Mawlana Nanotwi and other researchers is that when the Glorious Qur'an describes Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) "Seal of the Ambiya", both types of Sealship, essential and chronological, are established by it. But, the commoners understand

only one type of Sealship as its intended meaning, i.e. only chronological.

However, the disagreement between Hazrat Mawlana and the commoners is not over the Chronological Sealship of Nubuwwat *(for all are unanimous on this issue)*, nor is it over the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" being intended for Chronological Sealship. Hazrat Mawlana accepts both these postulates. The disagreement is over whether the phrase "Seal of the Prophets" is intended for both Chronological Sealship and Essential Sealship or not. Hazrat Mawlana is a proponent of the former view, and he wrote a few possible scenarios for its linguistic viability:

1. The word "Seal" is a homonym relating to the meaning (*mushtarak ma'nawi*)[13], and just as in a homonym relating to the meaning, all its components are intended, in the same way, here, in this noble verse too, both types of Sealship are intended.

---

[13] There are two types of homonyms (*mushtarak*), one relating to the word (*lafzi*) and one to the meaning (*ma'nawi*). An example of the first is "*'ayn*" which can mean "eye," "spring," "spy" and other meanings but when used in a sentence has only one meaning. An example of the second is "*naas*" (humanity) which is a homonym relating to the meaning as it comprises of both men and women, and when used in a sentence such a homonym includes all its subcategories.

2. The second scenario is that one meaning is literal and the other is metaphorical and by the method of "the generality of the metaphor" *('umum al-majaz*)[14], such a general meaning will be taken which incorporates both types of Sealship.

In both these scenarios, the indication of the word "Seal" is completely compatible (*mutabiqi*) to both types of Sealship.

3. A third scenario is that only Essential Sealship is intended by the word "Seal" in the Noble Qur'an, but since by rational and transmitted proofs, Chronological Sealship is a necessary consequence of it, in this scenario too, Chronological Sealship will be indicated by the noble verse in an implicative (*iltizami*) way[15].

Hazrat Mawlana Nanotwi (rahmatullah alayh), stating his own preference, explains that "Sealship" is a genus *(jiens)* and Chronological and Essential Sealship are two species *(anwaa')* of it. The Glorious Qur'an embraces both types from the term "Seal," in much the same way as the the term,

---

[14] This is another juristic and linguistic principle where the metaphorical meaning of a certain word broadens the original linguistic meaning of the word so as to incorporate its literal meaning and any other meanings intended by the metaphor.

[15] For details of how Essential Sealship necessarily entails Chronological Sealship based on transmitted and rational proofs, see the explanation in Appendix A

filth (rijs) in the noble verse, *"Wine, gambling, altars and divining arrows, are only filth (rijs)," (5:90)* simultaneously includes both external and internal types of filth. In fact, if considered carefully, Essential Sealship and Chronological Sealship are not such divergent issues as are wine and gambling in terms of the degree of their difference in impurity.

The upshot of Hazrat Mawlana Qasim Sahib's methodology in the exegesis of the word "Seal of the Ambiya" is that Allah's Rasool (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is both the Chronological Seal and the Essential Seal, and both these types of Sealship emanate from the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" mentioned in the Noble Qur'an.

The Correct Meaning of the Passages from *Tahzir al-Naas*

I shall now present the correct meaning of the three sentences which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib fused to create a content of kufr.

The first sentence is from page 14, and here Hazrat Nanotwi is further explaining the abovementioned research on "Essential Sealship," and in this particular place, the full passage of *Tahzir al-Naas* is as follows:

"The objective is that if Sealship in the meaning I presented [i.e. Essential Sealship] is determined as one of the meanings of "Seal of the Ambiya", then his position as the Seal will not be specifically in relation to past Ambiya, for if it were assumed[16] that in his own time any Nabi appeared, even then his position as the Seal will remain sound."

Khan Sahib deleted the underlined part from which every person understands that this text of Mawlana Nanotwi is regarding Essential Sealship and is not in regards to Chronological Sealship. He (i.e. the Bid'ati) quoted an incomplete passage. He further committed the injustice (chicanery and fraud) of joining it to a sentence from page 28 in such a way that not only is the page number not mentioned but between the sentences there is no demarcation. In quoting this sentence [from page 28], there is also clear deception. Here, the full passage is as follows:

"Yes, if Sealship in the sense of an intrinsic embodiment of the capacity of Nubuwwat is taken, as this humble one has submitted, then besides Allah's Rasool (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) any other individual intended for creation cannot be considered equal to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rather, in this way not only is his

---

[16] The word "assumed" (*bil farz*) is also worth noting. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

superiority over extant individual Ambiya established, but also his superiority over even conceivable (latent) (*muqaddar*) individuals is established. Therefore, even <u>if it were assumed after the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that any nabi was born, even then there would be no difference to the Sealship of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)</u>.

In this passage also, Mawlawi Ahmad Rida Khan Sahib undertook the (fraudulent) action of deleting the very important part from the first section from which readers will clearly understand that here only Essential Sealship is being discussed not chronological, and they will also know the belief of the author in relation to the superiority of the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He (the Bid'ati Fraud) further joined this incomplete sentence to another incomplete sentence of page 3 without any separation between them.

Anyhow, in these sentences on pages 14 and 28, Mawlana Nanotwi was only discussing Essential Sealship, explaining that this is such a Sealship that ***supposing*** if in his time or after his time any nabi were to come, even then there will be no difference in this Sealship. Here, Chronological Sealship is not discussed at all, and no sane (Muslim) person can say that if a nabi were to come after Rasulullah

(Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), that would cause no difference to his Chronological Sealship.

Comment by Mujlisul Ulama

In fact, even in terms of chronological order, the Seal (Khaatam) of Nubuwwat of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will not be affected and not a kink will develop in it, even if another Nabi had to appear. Thus, the appearance of Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) in proximity to Qiyaamah will not detract by even an iota from the perfection and completion of the *Khaatamiyyat* of Nabi Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The argument that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) was born before Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) does not invalidate the assumption in view of the fact that chronologically speaking he (Nabi Isaa – alayhis salaam) will appear towards the approach of Qiyaamah, and this incidence is chronologically speaking after the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). When he appears, he will not be stripped of his capacity of Nubuwwat. Nevertheless, the Seal of Nubuwwat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) remains intact and unblemished. The concept propounded by Hadhrat Nanotwi (rahmatullah alayh) embraces all dimensions of *Khaatamiyyat*. *(End of our comment).*

Explaining the Intent of Mawlana Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh) by an Example

An illustration of this concept is as follows:

In some country a pandemic spreads. One after another, many doctors are sent by the king and they treat patients according to their ability. At the end, this kind and generous king sends the greatest and most skilled physician who was the teacher of all the doctors sent previously, and he announces: "Now after him no doctor will come. In the future whenever anybody becomes ill, the prescription of this final doctor should be used, and he will be cured, and after him whoever claims to be a doctor sent from the king, he is lying and must be executed." Then this doctor opens his clinic and multitudes of patients attend and are cured. In one decree, the king addressed this doctor as "the seal of doctors." Now, the commoners understood from this that its meaning is only that this doctor is the last doctor in terms of time and no other doctor will be sent from the king, but one group of the people of understanding, while knowing with certainty that this is the last doctor that was sent, said that this great doctor was not called "the seal of doctors" only for the reason that he is the last doctor; rather, it is also because the medical knowledge of all the earlier doctors culminates at this great doctor, and

all other doctors are his students and only learnt the science of medicine from him. This is a second reason for calling him "the seal of doctors." And these two types of sealship emerge from the term "seal of doctors." And if you think carefully you will realise that the king sent this skilled doctor at the end also because in the science of medicine he surpasses all and is more skilled than all doctors and he is their teacher, as the principle is that doctors are referred to in the order of hierarchy. After traversing all lower stages, the king sent the highest doctor. Anyhow, this doctor is not the seal in terms of time alone, rather he is also a seal in terms of perfection in the science of medicine, and this second sealship is such that supposing that in his time and even after him another doctor were to come, there would be no difference in his sealship."

Readers should assess that if any adversary due to intransigence, said with respect to this group of intelligent people that they do not accept that this physician is the seal of doctors in terms of chronological order, and that they deny this belief, it will be a great distortion and blatant shamelessness because they do proclaim the essential and chronological aspects of the sealship of this imperial doctor. They explicitly maintain that with respect to time he is also the last doctor, and after him no doctor will be sent by the king. And,

if any doctor after him claims to be sent by the king, he must be executed.

This then is the correct meaning of the sentences from pages 14 and 28. The third sentence, from page 3 of *Tahzir al-Naas*, which Khan Sahib quoted last, remains. It should be understood that this sentence is in effect the beginning of *Tahzir al-Naas*. The words are as follows:

“After praising Allah and sending blessings on the Nabi, before answering the question, I ask that the meaning of “the Seal of the Ambiya” first be understood, so that no time is taken in answering the question. It is the understanding of the commoners that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is a Seal in the sense that his time came after the time of the earlier Ambiya and that he is the last of all the Ambiya. But it will become clear to the people of understanding that in coming earlier or later in time, there is intrinsically no virtue.”

There are two things worth noting from this passage: first, Mawlana Nanotwi is not speaking about the issue of the Seal of Nubuwwat, rather he is discussing the meaning of the phrase “Seal of the Ambiya”. Second, taking the intent of Chronological Seal from “Seal” was not regarded as the understanding of the commoners, but its restriction

to Chronological Sealship was regarded as the understanding of the commoners, and this understanding was disputed by Mawlana Nanotwi. Otherwise, taking the meaning of Chronological Sealship with Essential Sealship is the concept of Mawlana Nanotwi himself, which was demonstrated earlier, and which Mawlana explained in full detail on pages 8 and 9 of *Tahzir al-Naas*.

Anyhow, since according to Hazrat Mawlana, Chronological Sealship is also intended by the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya"[17], it must, therefore, be accepted that here it is only the restriction to Chronological Sealship which Mawlana expressed as the understanding of the commoners. Mawlana's intent is that the commoners believe that the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" is confined to only Chronological Sealship, and besides this nothing else is established, while according to the people of intelligence, both Chronological and Essential Sealship are confirmed by this statement of the Glorious Qur'an.

This also answers the objection that Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib produced in *al-Mawt al-*

---

[17] A full explanation of this has passed above, and the statement of Mawlana Nanotwi has passed a few pages earlier that in his opinion those hadiths which clearly indicate the Chronological Sealship of Nubuwwat like "there is no Nabi after me" were derived from the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya." (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

Ahmar against this passage of *Tahzir al-Naas.T*hat is:

"In this [book], taking the meaning of Chronological Seal from "Seal of the Ambiya" was expressed as the understanding of the commoners while this meaning of "Seal" was stated by the Nabi, the Joy of the World (Allah bless him and grant him peace), and it is also narrated from his noble Companions. Consequently, according to the author of *Tahzir al-Naas*, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and all the noble Sahabah are included amongst the commoners. (Allah forbid!)"

The answer is that the author of *Tahzir al-Naas* did not consider taking the intent of Chronological Sealship from "Seal" as the understanding of commoners; rather, he regarded restriction of "Seal" to Chronological Sealship as the understanding of the commoners. And restriction ((i.e. restriction to only the chronological dimension) is not established from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) nor from any Sahabi. In fact, restriction has not been propounded by the firmly-grounded Ulama, and nobody can venture to claim such restriction, since the Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said regarding the verses of the Qur'an, "*For every verse there is an outward and an inward (meaning- i.e. an exoteric*

and an esoteric meaning), and for every letter there is a boundary, and for every boundary there is a spectacle," from which is known that every verse of the Qur'an has at least two meanings. And if the wording of restriction is found in the statements of the Ulama of the past, it does not refer to literal restriction which Mawlana Nanotwi expressed as the understanding of the commoners, but its intent is relative restriction i.e. in relation to the false interpretation of the heretics.

Anyway, if anyone maintains this slander against the author of *Tahzir al-Naas*, that he (Allah forbid!) described the explanation of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the understanding of the commoners, he should prove restriction from the Messenger (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or from any Sahabi.

Furthermore Mawlana Nanotwi in his *Maktubaat* (letters) also clearly explained what is meant by "commoners" in the subject of Qur'anic exegesis. On this subject, Hazrat's words are: "Apart from the Ambiya and the Ulama well-grounded in knowledge, all are to be counted amongst the commoners in the science of exegesis." (*Qasim al-'Ulum*, no. 1, letter 2, p. 4)

Despite this explicit statement, to say of the author of *Tahzir al-Naas* that he included Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the noble Sahabah amongst the commoners is extreme dishonesty.

Support for Mawlana Nanotwi's Methodology in the Exegesis of "Seal of the Ambiya" from the Statements of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself.

It should also be understood that those who attribute only one meaning to the designation, "Seal of the Ambiya", are according to the Barelwi learned man also included amongst the commoners and not amongst the people of intelligence. The aforementioned learned man wrote on page 43 of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*:

"It is narrated from Abu al-Darda' (Radhiyallahu anhu): "A man will not fully understand until he discerns multiple viewpoints in the Qur'an." I say: Ibn Sa'd transmitted it from Abu al-Darda' (Radhiyallahu anhu) in *al-Tabaqat*, and Abu Nu'aym in *al-Hilyah* and Ibn 'Asakir in his *Taarikh* and Muqatil ibn Sulayman mentioned it at the start of his book on the interpretations of the Qur'an, tracing it to Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the wording: "A man will not have a full understanding until he finds many viewpoints in

the Qur'an." It says in *al-Itqaan*: "Some of them interpreted it in that the intent is to find one word bearing multiple meanings such that one accepts them [all] when they are not conflicting; and he does not restrict it to one meaning."

From this passage of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, rather from this narration of Abu al-Darda' (Radhiyallahu anhu), it is clearly recognised that the person who takes only one meaning from a verse of the Qur'an and restricts it to this one meaning will be included amongst the commoners and not from the people of intelligence. One will only be a person of perfect understanding when multiple non-conflicting meanings are taken as the intent of a single verse, just as Hazrat Mawlana Muhammad Qasim (Rahmatullah alayh) had established three types of Sealship for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the basis of the one phrase, "Seal of the Ambiya," meaning essential, chronological and spatial.

All praise to Allah, the correct meaning of the three sentences of *Tahzir al-Naas* has been explained, and it is known to the readers that those people whom Hazrat Nanotwi called commoners on page 3 of *Tahzir al-Naas* are commoners according to the Barelwi learned man also. I also want to say that from this research, the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi

wasallam), along with being the Chronological Seal is also the Positional Seal and Essential Seal, i.e. he is the essential Nabi while other Ambiya are accidental Ambiya.*(i.e. Their Nubuwwat is not intrinsic, but derived from the Nubuwwat of Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam).* The perfections of his Nubuwwat were given directly by Allah Almighty while the other Ambiya received Nubuwwat through the medium of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In this view too, Hazrat Nanotwi is not alone. Many earlier research Ulama stated exactly this view[18]. However, I feel there is no need to increase the volume of this treatise by quoting their statements because Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself also mentioned this. Therefore, there is no need to quote any other text. I shall quote one passage from him in this respect to conclude the discussion.

This learned man wrote on page 23 of his treatise *Jaza' Allah 'Aduwwah*:

[18] An example is the early mystic al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi (d. 320) who offered a similar explanation to the phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" and explicitly stated that restricting its meaning to the last nabi (chronologically speaking) is the view of the ignorant, as there is no [intrinsic] virtue and praise in this. For a translation of this passage, see Appendix B.

“And from recurrent clear texts of the noble saints and the glorious imaams and luminous scholars it is evident that every blessing, whether little or much, small or big, physical or spiritual, religious or worldly, outward or inward, from the first day till now and from now till the Resurrection, and from the Resurrection till the afterlife, and from the afterlife to eternity, whether a believer or disbeliever, obedient or disobedient, angel or man, jinn or animal, rather everything besides Allah which is acquired by anyone or has been acquired or will be acquired, its bud opens or opened or will open with his gracious breeze, and is distributed or was distributed or will be distributed from his hand. He is the secret of existence and the foundation of existence and the greatest vicegerent of Allah and the one given charge of the bounty of the world (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace). He (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) said this himself: “I am Abu al-Qasim. Allah gives and I distribute.” Al-Haakim narrated it in *al-Mustadrak* and authenticated it and the critics agreed with him.”

From this passage of the Barelwi learned man, it is acknowledged that whatever spiritual, bodily, worldly, religious, outward and inward blessing is acquired by anyone, it is a consequence of the generous favour of the Rasool (Sallallahu alayhi

wasallam). Since Nubuwwat is also one of the highest levels of spiritual blessings, this too is acquired by the other Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) through the medium of the Rasool (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The name of this reality according to the terminology of Hazrat Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi is "Essential" or "Positional Sealship." I will now close the discussion here, and I will turn my attention towards Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's slander against Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Sahib Muhaddith Gangohi – the slander of attributing lies to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The Slander against Hazrat Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Sahib Gangohi (May is his Soul be sanctified) of Attributing Lies to Allah Azza Wa Jal, and its Reply

On page 13 of *Husaam al-Haramayn*, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib wrote in regards to Hazrat Mawlana Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh):

"Then the state of wrongdoing and deviance persisted in him until he stated in a fatwa of his, which I saw with my eyes in his handwriting and with his seal, and it was printed many times in Mumbai and other cities along with its refutation, that the one who attributes an actual lie to Allah Almighty and explicitly states that He (Glorified and

Exalted is He) has lied and that this enormity emerged from Him, then don't attribute to him transgression, let alone deviance, and let alone disbelief, for indeed many of the imaams have professed his opinion and the most that could be said is that he has erred in his interpretation.

They are the ones Allah Ta'ala has deafened and He has blinded their sights, and there is no might, nor power, except with Allah, the High, the Great." (*Husaam al-Haramayn*, p. 13)

This worthless slave submits that the attribution of this fatwa to Hazrat Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) is an outright fabrication and slander. In the earlier discussion, it was mentioned that Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib had joined three separate passages from *Tahzir al-Naas* to create a content of disbelief. Here, even this was not possible. With praise to Allah, I can say with full confidence that these words are not found in any fatwa of Hazrat Gangohi, nor are they the meaning of any fatwa. Rather, the reality is that this is a clear fabrication by either Khan Sahib or one of his rivals. With praise to Allah, we and our elders (*akaabir*) declare such a person a disbeliever, and an accursed apostate, who attributes lies to Allah Azza Wa Jal, and claims that a lie had actually issued from Him. In fact, the wretched person who doubts that this is

disbelief, we believe that even he is outside the fold of Islam. Hazrat Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Sahib Gangohi (May his Soul be sanctified) himself wrote in his published *Fatawa* on volume 1, page 118:

"The Pure Zaat of the Allah Azza Wa Jal is glorious and transcends being predicated with the attribute of lies, Allah forbid. There is no trace of falsehood in His speech. Allah Ta'ala said: *"And who is more truthful than Allah in speech?"* (Qur'an 4:122)

The person who holds this corrupt belief regrading Allah Azza Wa Jal, or mentions it, is guilty of a dastardly lie. Certainly he is an accursed disbeliever and an opponent of the Qur'aan, Hadith and the Ijma' (Consensus) of the Ummah. He can never be a believer. Allah transcends what the blasphemous oppressors say."

Readers should assess fairly the degree of evil of the attribution of the blasphemous slander despite the clear and unequivocal fatwa of Hazrat Gangohi. Vile indeed is it to slander Hazrat Gangohi with the blasphemous falsehood of Allah Ta'ala having actually lied, or to say the one who said this remains a Muslim. Justice shall be meted out on the Day of Judgement!

Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's statement "which I saw with my eyes in his handwriting and

with his seal" remains for rebuttal. In reply to this, I will only say that since in this fourteenth century [after Hijrah], a "scholar" and "mufti" sliced three separate passages from pages 3, 14 and 28 of a printed and published book, *Tahzir al-Naas*, and by distorting them created a content of disbelief and attributed that to the author of *Tahzir al-Naas*, what difficulty is there for him to fabricate a fatwa with another's handwriting and seal? Are there no fabricators or forgers in the world? It is well-known that in Bareli and its neighbouring towns there are many experts in this field whose livelihood is by means of such forgeries.

Anyhow, the fatwa of Hazrat Gangohi which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib mentioned has no basis. *Fatawa Rashidiyyah* which was printed and published in three volumes has no mention of it, rather the complete opposite of it is found in several fatwas within it, of which one was quoted above. Even assuming Khan Sahib truly saw a fatwa of this kind, it is certainly the result of the fabrication and machination of a rival "scholar" or predecessor of his.

To bury the glory and greatness of the revered Ulama and masters, people of envy had committed such types of misdeeds in earlier times too. In this respect, I will relate some enlightening incidents:

The great jurist and Hadith master of this Ummah, Hazrat Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal (Rahmatullah alayh), was on the verge of departing from this world, and a truly envious, wretched person at that time put under his pillow some papers with writing on them that were full of heretical beliefs and views so that people will believe that these writings are the fruits of Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal's mind, and when they are found to be contrary to Islamic teachings, they will hold a bad opinion of the Imaam. Thus his greatness and honour will be eliminated from hearts of people, and then the glitter of these forgers, which was diminished by the overwhelming effusion of the Imaam will once again shine.

The Imaam of lexicography, 'Allaamah Majd al-Din al-Fayruzabadi (Rahmatullah alayh), the author *al-Qamus*, was alive. He was a famous imaam and an authority for the elite and commoners. Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani (Rahmatullah alayh), although a great Hadith master, benefited from his knowledge. Envious people could not tolerate his widespread acceptance. In order to taint his greatness and popularity, they wrote a whole book with insults against Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) under his name in which they virulently accused Hazrat Imam A'zam (Rahmatullah alayh) of disbelief. This fabricated book was distributed far

and wide to distant and unfamiliar places. In the Hanafi world, opposition to ‘Allamah Fayruzabadi (Rahmatullah alayh) reached the utmost degree of hysteria. However, the innocent ‘Allamah was completely unaware of this until the book reached Abu Bakr al-Khayyat al-Baghawi al-Yamani, whereupon he wrote a letter to ‘Allamah Fayruzabadi asking about the book. The aforementioned ‘Allamah wrote in his reply:

“If this book has reached you, burn it, because it is a fabrication of enemies. I am from the greatest believers in Imam Abu Hanifah, and I have enumerated his virtues in a book.”

Imam Mustafa al-Qarmani al-Hanafi, with great effort, wrote a detailed commentary of *Muqaddamah Abu al-Layth al-Samarqandi*. When he completed it, he came to Egypt with a view to showing it to the Ulama before publishing it. With praise to Allah, the compilation was successful. Some jealous people were irritated by this, and they believed that by its publication the light of our markets will be diminished. They were unable to do anything besides the wickedness of fabricating and interpolating in the book. In the chapter of the etiquettes of relieving oneself, on the issue of not facing the sun and moon while relieving oneself, they added: “because Ibrahim (alayhis salaam)

would worship them" (Allah forbid!). 'Allamah al-Qarmani was unaware of this evil. Without knowledge of this, he presented the book before the Ulama of Egypt and when their eyes fell on this statement, there was severe outrage and uproar in all of Egypt against 'Allamah al-Qarmani. The Qaadi of the time decreed that he deserved the death penalty. The poor soul fled from Egypt in the night to save his life.

(This qaadhi must indeed have been the master of morons for having issued such a dangerously unjust silly decree without a valid Shar'i trial to ascertain the reality and the truth – Mujlisul Ulama)

Aarif Billaah, Imaam 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Sha'rani, wrote an autobiographical note in his book *al-Yawaqit wa al-Jawahir*:

"Likewise, they – the jealous folk – fabricated against me in my book called *al-Bahr al-Mawrud* a number of false beliefs, and they propagated those beliefs in Egypt and Makkah for around three years, and I am free from them as I explained in the introduction to the book when I revised it. The 'ulama wrote endorsements on it and licensed it, and the chaos did not abate until I sent to them the copy on which was their endorsements."

Only a few incidents have been related in this brief account. If historical and biographical works are consulted, one will find many similar shameful incidents of the fabrications of the wretched and envious people.

Thus, if the reality is that the Barelwi learned man was truthful in this explanation, that he in fact saw this fatwa attributed to Hazrat Gangohi with the abovementioned content with his handwriting and seal, it certainly does not detract from it being a fabrication. Furthermore, still it would never have been permissible for Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib to issue a fatwa of disbelief based on it. It had to be first verified whether it was the fatwa of Hazrat Mawlana or not. It is a well-known and accepted principle of jurisprudence that "a handwriting resembles [another] handwriting" or " a handwriting may be confused with another's handwriting." Khan Sahib himself is not unaware of this. For example, to prove that it is not permissible to determine moon sighting by means of handwriting and telegram, he states:

"In all books it is clearly written: "One handwriting resembles [another] handwriting," "handwriting is not acted upon." (*Malfuzat A'la Hazrat* 2:52)

Since handwriting is not taken into consideration in such small matters as moon sighting, how can *takfir* which is a far more grave matter, be established by this consideration?

Those 'proofs' which Khan Sahib presented to 'confirm' the attribution of this fabricated fatwa to Hazrat Gangohi in *Tamhid e Iman* are extremely foolish and flimsier than a spider's web. Readers will shortly see and ascertain this for themselves.

Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib wrote in *Tamhid e Iman* with regards to this fabricated fatwa:

"It has been 18 years since this impure fatwa attributing lie to Allah Ta'ala was published in 1308 with the treatise *Siyanat al-Naas* from Hadiqat al-'Ulum Press, Meerut, along with a refutation. Then in 1318 Hijri from Gulzar e Hasani Press, Mumbai, it was printed again with a more detailed refutation. Then in 1320 Hijri, with another stronger refutation it was printed in Tuhfat e Hanafiyya Press in Patna, Azimabad. The person who gave the fatwa died in Jumada al-Akhirah 1323 Hijri, and remained silent till the last dying breath. He did not say "this is not my fatwa" although it was easier than rejecting a fatwa published in books. And he didn't say that its meaning is not what the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah [meaning, himself and others] said, but 'my intention was so-and-so'. Disbelief is no small matter to which no attention is paid."

After removing the filth and excess, the upshot of Khan Sahib's proof boils down to the following:

1. The fatwa with a refutation was printed three times in the lifetime of Mawlana Gangohi.

2. He did not deny the attribution of this fatwa to himself, nor did he mention another meaning of it.

3. And since the matter is so grave, silence will not be taken into consideration.

4. Thus, it is established that this fatwa is his, and its meaning is also that on which I based my *takfir*.

Even though the foolishness and stupidity of this 'proof' are in no need of my examination and criticism, as every person with a little intellect can with little deliberation and consideration understand its absurdity, yet it seems appropriate to shed some light on every part of it while also giving the readers some insight into the "knowledge" and "revivalism" of Khan Sahib.

Khan Sahib's first premise was that the fatwa with a refutation was printed three times. It is acknowledged in this premise that the fabricated fatwa was only printed by opponents of Mawlana Gangohi. It was never published on behalf of the

Mawlana or any of his close associates. With regards to this, I will only say that if the explanation of Khan Sahib is accepted as being true and it was conceded that the fatwa was printed and published several times with its refutation in the lifetime of Hazrat Gangohi, still it is not necessary that it reached Hazrat or even that he was aware of it. If it was sent to him, the question is: Was it sent by a definite path or an indefinite one? And was Khan Sahib informed of its arrival by him? If he was, was that through definite or indefinite means? Giving a categorical verdict of kufr while ignoring all these angles of the issue can never be allowed. Anyhow, as long as it is not established with certainty that Hazrat Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayhi) wrote any such fatwa, and that the definite and stipulated meaning was that which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib wrote, passing a ruling of disbelief is definitely unbefitting and sinful. Hazrat Mawlana Gangohi was a reclusive *Aarif* of Allah whose condition was without exaggeration:

In remembrance of the beloved, from the world is he distracted

A considerable period of this humble one's [i.e. Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani] time has been spent only in the midst of the people of falsehood, *(i.e. the Barelwi Qabar Pujaaris)* yet to this day I have

been deprived of seeing these three editions of this fabricated fatwa which were mentioned by Khan Sahib. They may exist, but this reasonably indicates that Hazrat Gangohi was not even aware of this tale. *(The fact that despite living in the midst of the Bid'atis, Maulana Manzoor Nomaani had not seen the fabricated fatwa, supports the contention that Hadhrat Gangohi who was no where near to the area of the Bid'atis had not seen it.)*

Khan Sahib's second premise was that Mawlana Gangohi did not deny the fatwa, nor did he offer any interpretation for it. In relation to this, firstly, since awareness is not established, what is there to deny and what is there to interpret? And supposing he was aware of it, he felt that this impure act of the ungodly fabricators does not deserve his attention, or in order to consign the affair to Allah Ta'ala, he preferred to maintain silence.

The premise that the attribution of kufr to someone is not a matter which could be ignored. *(Thus, according to the Bid'ati molvi, Hadhrat Gangohi was supposed to have responded in some way. Since he did not respond, he was guilty of the kufr. This is the logic of the chief of the Qabar Pujaaris.).*

This contention is itself baseless. That silence on an issue of gravity is guilt is not an axiomatic consequence. *(In other words, Hadhrat Gangohi's silence may not be interpreted as guilt or that he was even aware of the fabricated fatwa attributed to him. There could have been several reasons for his silence).* It is possible he did not believe denial was necessary because believers would not accept such filthy slander, or he thought that those repulsive people who launched this slander will have no recognition in the academic and religious world. Their slanderous charges would therefore enjoy no consideration. Any of these reasons could have been the cause for the silence.

Furthermore, regardless of these explanations, it is incorrect to say that "the matter of disbelief is grave." *(i.e. as propounded by the Bid'ati chief of the Grave-Worshippers).* Undoubtedly before the advent of the appearance of Khan Sahib, *takfir* was an issue of *utmost gravity*. However, I am forced to say that from the day that the pen was unsheathed from its scabbard into the 'intrepid' hands of Khan Sahib, *takfir* became an issue of insignificance. We seek refuge with Allah Ta'ala!

His verdicts of kufr include the Ulama of Nadwat al-'Uluma – that they are disbelievers, and those who do not call them disbelievers are disbelievers.

The Ulama of Deoband are disbelievers, and those who do not call them disbelievers are disbelievers. The non-conformists (*ghayr muqallidin*) of the Ahl e Hadith are disbelievers. Mawlana 'Abd al-Bari Sahib Farangi Mahalli is a disbeliever, as well as his brother in Tariqa, Mawlawi 'Abd al-Majid Badayuni who committed the 'crime' of joining the Khilafat Movement, and Mawlawi 'Abd al-Qadir Sahib Badayuni are disbeliever. Takfir was his profession which he relentlessly pursued. Allah have mercy. Besides the few groups of people in Bareli no one remained a Muslim.

Thus it is possible, to say that this turmoil and uproar of Khan Sahib and those like him who call godly people disbelievers, are the barking of dogs. *(In fact the Hadith labels Bid'atis as the 'dogs of the fire'.)* Thus Maulana Gangohi preferred to maintain silence. The principle is:

Indeed I pass by the base one who insults me

I pass by from there saying: It does not concern me.

And it is possible that Hazrat Mawlana Gangohi was aware and he also denied the fabricated fatwa, but Khan Sahib was unaware of this denial. How can the absence of denial be known from unawareness

of that denial? Does absence of knowledge necessitate the absence of the thing?

The people of knowledge and fairness should assess that with all these possibilities is *takfir* still permissible?

The claim *(i.e. of the Bid'ati molvi)* as stated in his book, is:

"This extremely cautious person (meaning, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself) never called those enemies (referring to Hazrat Gangohi and others) disbelievers until their explicit disbelief was not absolutely confirmed and was brighter than the light of the sun. This left no room [for doubt] and interpretation at all." (*Tamhid e Iman* p. 44)

Yet, the 'evidence' is so fallacious *(being figments of the Bid'ati molvi's imagination)* that it precludes even speculaton and conjecturing. If with such fallacies *kufr* could be established, then may Allah protect Islam and Muslims. If any ignoramus or lunatic calls a pious, Allah-fearing man a kaafir, and someone avers that this is unacceptable, then according to Khan Sahib's principles he is a kaafir. It indeed boggles credulity.

If it was only this mufti and this fatwa

The work of faith will be completely undone.

On the one hand, we have the statements of the noble Fuqaha that if there are 99 possibilities of *kufr* and one possibility of *Imaan*, even then *takfir* is not permissible. On the other hand, we have here in this fourteenth century, this self-made reviver Sahib who deceitfully structured his purely fanciful and imaginary premises to produce this unfounded conclusion, viz. that the fatwa in question was authored by Mawlana Gangohi, hence the fatwa of absolute *kufr.* Even the one who doubts *(the imagined and slandered kufr of Hadhrat Gangohi)* is a kaafir according to this Khan Sahib. Ponder at this wide divergence in the two respective pathways - the way of the Fuqaha and the way of the 14th century self-manufactured 'reviver of the faith'.

Hitherto, the discussion has been in the format of a debate (*munazarah*). I also wish to say that when one of Hazrat Gangohi's associates saw the fabrication of the innovators towards the end of his life, he wrote a request to Hazrat enquiring about it. Hazrat in his reply declared his innocence, and expressed his displeasure at the accursed content. Khan Sahib was aware of this, and yet he did not retract the fatwa of *kufr*. This, exhibits the intention and *mala fides* of these champions of *takfir* and of their progeny.

Thus, in 1323 Hijri, when Hazrat Mawlana Murtaza Hasan Sahib[19] saw this fabricated fatwa in a treatise of a firm supporter of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, Miyanji 'Abd al-Rahman Pukhrirawi, he sent a request to Gangoh asking about the reality of the fatwa and the *kufr* content attributed to the Hazrat Gangohi. Hazrat responded: "This is an outright fabrication and pure slander. Can any sensible person write such villainy?"

The answer of Hazrat Gangohi was reproduced in many treatises of Mawlana Sayyid Murtaza Hasan Sahib, also in *al-Sahab al-Midrar* and *Tazkiyat al-Khawaatir*, and all of these treatises were sent to Khan Sahib in his lifetime.

Also, when this slander began to spread in Bareli, from here, too, some associates of the Hazrat sent a request inquiring about the reality of the situation. In this answer, Hazrat Gangohi also

---

[19] Mawlana Sayyid Murtaza Hasan Chandpuri (1868-1951) was alive at the time of writing this book and on its first publication date in 1933 CE. He was a graduate of Dar al-'Ulum Deoband where he studied under some of its greatest teachers, including Mawlana Muhammad Ya'qub Nanotwi, Shaykh al-Hind Mawlana Mahmud al-Hasan Gangohi, Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi and Mawlana Dhu al-Fiqar 'Ali Deobandi. He excelled in the rational sciences under Mawlana Ahmad Hasan Amrohi in Kanpur. He earned his livelihood by working as a Hakim having attained adequate knowledge and experience in this profession from his father, a renowned Hakim of his city. In the spiritual path, he gained successorship (*khlilafa*) in the Chisti Sabiri chain from Hakim al-Ummah Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Thanawi.

expressed his displeasure and dissociation. His written answer was seen by Khan Sahib, but it had no effect on his heart of stone, and the fear of Allah Ta'ala did not induce him to concede his error.

"Then your hearts hardened thereafter. Thus they are as stones or harder. Verily, There are some stones from which gush forth rivers, and verily there are of them some that cleave asunder and water issues from them, and verily there are of them some that roll down in fear of Allah." (Qur'an 2:74)

On the basis of these realities I am forced to believe and say that Khan Sahib's verdict of *kufr* from the very first day was not based on a misunderstanding or on ignorance, but the reality is that it was fabricated purely out of the vicious flames of spite, love of fame and indulgence. "And those who perpetrate injustice will soon know the abode to which they will return." (Qur'an 26:227)

The Vile Slander against Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) of Diminishing the Rank of the Leader of the Ambiya

(Sallallaahu alayhi wa alayhim wa sallam)

Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib wrote on page 15 of *Husaam al-Haramayn*:

“These are followers of the accursed Shaitaan of the horizons, and they are also scions of the one who attributes lies [to Allah], i.e. al-Gangohi, for indeed he [i.e. Mawlana Khalil Ahmad al-Saharanpuri] stated clearly in his book *al-Baraahin al-Qat'iah* – and by Allah it (i.e. this book) only cuts (*qati'ah*) what Allah has ordered to tie – that their master, Iblis, has more expansive knowledge than the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace). This is his deplorable text with his despicable wording:

“Indeed this expanse in knowledge was established for Satan and the Angel of Death by clear text. Which clear text is there regarding the expansive knowledge of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) so that all texts will be rejected because of it and a *shirk* will be established?”

He wrote before this:

“Indeed this *shirk* does not contain a mustard seed of faith.”

Then after transmitting some "blessings"[20] on the author of *Baraahin*, he wrote after a few lines:

"Indeed it says in *Nasim al-Riyad* as has preceded:

"Whoever says, 'so-and-so is more learned than him (i.e. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam),' indeed he has faulted him and degraded him, so he is an insulter, and the ruling on him is the ruling of an insulter without distinction. We make no exception of any situation thereof, and all of this is consensus from the Companions (Allah be pleased with them)."

Then I say: Look at the effects of Allah's seal, how it makes the seeing blind, and how he chooses blindness over guidance. He believes in comprehensive (all-encompassing) earthly knowledge for Iblis, and when the mention of Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace), is made, he says, "This is *shirk*." *Shirk* is only to affirm a partner for Allah Almighty, so when affirming something for any of creation is *shirk*, it will definitely be *shirk* for all creation, since it is not possible for anyone to be a partner of Allah Almighty. So look, how he believes

[20] Meaning, insults and curses, but such unjustified insults and curses serve to elevate the rank of the pious, so are in fact counted as "blessings."

that Iblis is His (Glorified is He) partner, and partnership is negated only from Muhammad (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace).

Then look at the cover of the anger of Allah Almighty over his sight. He demands for the knowledge of Muhammad (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) a clear text, and he will not be satisfied with it until it is decisive (*qat'i*), and when he comes to negating his (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) knowledge, in this explanation on page 46, six lines before this disgraceful [statement of] disbelief, he himself adheres to a false hadith having no basis in the religion and ascribes it falsely to one who did not transmit it but refuted it with a clear refutation, where he said:

"Shaykh 'Abd al-Haqq (May his Soul be sanctified) narrated from the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that he said: 'I do not know what is behind this wall.'"

However, the Shaykh (May his Soul be sanctified) only said in *Madaarij al-Nubuwwah*, as follows:

"Here this is made problematic because it has come in some narrations that the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'I am only a slave. I do not know what is behind this wall.' The answer to this

speech is it has no basis, and it is not valid to transmit it."

So look at how he draws proof from, "don't come near Salah" and omits, "while you are drunk."[21]

In this passage, to fulfil his yearning to pass the judgement of kufr, the injustice which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib committed against honesty and integrity, will only be reckoned by the One, the Irresistible. His interrogation will, if Allah wills, take place tomorrow on the Day of Judgement. However, fair-minded people in this world can also determine the degree of dishonesty in the explanation and in the verdict of this person who claims to be a reviver (*mujaddid*).

In this passage, Khan Sahib hurled the following calumnies against the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*:

1. He (Allah forbid!) averred that the blessed knowledge of Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was less than the knowledge of the accursed Satan.

---

[21] Meaning, he committed the same degree of dishonesty in quoting Shaykh 'Abd Haqq al-Dihlawi as one who quotes the Qur'an to say "Don't come near Salah" while failing to mention the part immediately after it "while you are drunk." (Qur'an 4:43)

2. He maintained that the affirmation of all-encompassing knowledge of the world for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was *shirk*, yet he affirmed this [knowledge] for the accursed Satan, while whatever is *shirk* to affirm for any creature, its affirmation for any other creature is certainly also *shirk*, so it is as though the author of *Baraahin* (Allah forbid!) made Satan a partner with Allah.

3. He demanded absolute texts for affirming the knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but when negating this knowledge for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he relied on a baseless narration.

4. Moreover, he mendaciously attributed the narration of this hadith to such a person who didn't transmit it but had quoted it in order to vehemently refute it.

This is a summary of the entire passage by Khan Sahib.

Before presenting the answer, I will outline a number of introductory principles:

First Introductory Principle

There are two types of knowledge: intrinsic (*dhati*) and granted (*'ata'i*). Intrinsic knowledge is that which is inherent in a being. It is not granted or

acquired from another being. Granted knowledge is that which has been acquired from somebody. The first type is exclusive to Allah Almighty. Whatever knowledge is possessed by creation is all granted and acquired. If someone were to affirm intrinsic knowledge for any Wali, Nabi or Angel, it is *shirk* by Consensus. This is a famous principle, agreed-upon by the entire Ummah. To prove it, it will suffice to quote the statements of Khan Sahib Barelwi as " *the accuser is a thousand times weightier than your witness"*

Khan Sahib wrote in *Khaalis al-I'tiqad*, page 28:

"Knowledge is certainly from those attributes that for other than the Creator, it can [only] be acquired through the bestowal of Allah. Thus, in terms of intrinsic (*dhati*) and acquired (*'ata'i*), its categorisation is certain (*yaqini*). The division of [knowledge into] encompassing and non-encompassing is intuitive (*badihi*). From these [subcategories of knowledge], those that are accepted as exclusive to Allah are the first from each category, meaning, intrinsic [knowledge] and absolutely all-encompassing [knowledge]."

Furthermore, in the same *Khaalis al-I'tiqad*, he wrote on page 32:

"Undoubtedly, for others besides Allah, there is not even one atom of intrinsic knowledge. This belief is from the necessities of religion, and its denier is a disbeliever."

And, in the "First Section" (*al-Nazr al-Awwal*) of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, on page 6, he wrote:

"The first (i.e. intrinsic knowledge) is restricted to the Master (Glorified and Exalted is He) and is impossible for other than Him. And whoever affirms a part of it, even if less than an atom for any of the worlds, he has disbelieved, associated a partner [with Allah], and is destroyed and ruined."

Second Introductory Principle

In relation to every atom in existence, Allah Almighty has infinite knowledge, and since no creature can have unlimited knowledge, it can be said that no creature can attain encompassing knowledge of the true reality of even one atom.

In proving this, I will also rely on the statements of Khan Sahib Barelwi. The aforementioned [Khan Sahib] wrote on page 9 of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*:

"Rather, He (Glorified and Exalted is He) has sciences in every atom that are unending, because every atom in relation to every [other] atom that was, will be or can be, has a relationship in terms of

nearness, distance and direction, different in time with different places that are actual or possible from the first day till eternity; and all is known to Him (Glorified and Exalted is He) in actuality, so His knowledge (Great is His Glory) is infinite multiplied by infinite.

And it is accepted that the knowledge of creation does not encompass in any single moment an infinite quantity [of knowledge] in actuality with complete detail whereby every particular is distinguished in that [knowledge] from its counterpart with complete distinction."

Furthermore, in the same *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah* on page 212, he wrote:

"I have explained that He (Glorified is He) has in each and every atom sciences that are never-ending, so how can anything be disclosed to creation in the way it is disclosed to the Creator (Great and Glorious is He)?"

Third Introductory Principle

In establishing a point of belief, decisive evidence is necessary, and in negating [a point of belief], merely the absence of proof is sufficient evidence. This is why in refuting the false thoughts and corrupt beliefs of the idolaters, the Qur'an mentions

that these are personal imaginations and Satanic whispers, and there is no evidence or proof presented from the Lord.

Furthermore, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself in *Inba' al-Mustafa* accepts that in establishing beliefs decisive evidence is necessary.

Fourth Introductory Principle

There are two types of knowledge: one which is related to religion, like all religious sciences of the Shari'ah; and second, that which is not related to religion, like knowledge of the particular states of Zayd, 'Amr, Ganga Persaud, Mr Churchill etc., knowledge of the number of insects on the earth and fish in the sea, and knowledge of their special properties, their general movements, consumption of food and drink, excretion and defecation. It is apparent that knowledge of these things has no relation to religion, and nor does knowledge of them have any impact on human perfection, and nor is absence of it a defect!

Although this principle is obvious and everyone possessing even a little intellect accepts it, for some time now, the spiritual descendants of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib have begun to deny it with persistent cunning, claiming that there is no knowledge in the world that has no relation to

religion and that has no impact on human perfection. Thus, here too, I feel it would be sufficient to just present one quote of Khan Sahib. Khan Sahib in his *Malfuzat*, Part 2, page 62, wrote: "Simiya (letter magic) is an impure science." From this short but significant sentence of Khan Sahib, it is immediately understood that some knowledge is impure, and it is obvious that the science that is impure cannot be religious knowledge, nor can it be a reason for perfection in any person.

Fifth Introductory Principle

The knowledge which the Shari'ah has praised and encouraged people to pursue, and which invites divine pleasure is only that knowledge which has a connection with the Deen. Human perfection is dependent on this knowledge. For example, the Glorious Qur'an says: *"Are those who know and those who do not know equal?" (Qur'an 39:9)*

Elsewhere, the Qur'aan says: *"Allah elevates those among you who believe and those given knowledge by degrees." (Qur'an 58:11)*

It is obvious that by these verses, neither English is intended, nor Sanskrit nor any other language, nor science, nor geography, nor magic, nor poetry, rather only knowledge of the Deen is intended, for that is beloved to Allah Ta'ala. In a noble hadith, it

is mentioned: *"Seeking knowledge is obligatory on every Muslim."* In another hadith it says: *"Verily, the Ambiya do not bequeath dinars or dirhams. They bequeath only knowledge. So whoever takes from it, takes a large share."*

In these noble hadiths, the objective is the science of Shari'ah and the science of the Deen. Only a wretched person can say that worldly sciences are also a Deeni obligation. Only a wretched person deprived of insight can say that such evil and futile sciences as magic and sorcery are also part of the inheritance of the Ambiya. it is manifestly obvious that the knowledge which the Shari'ah orders and encourages, and which has an impact on human perfection is the knowledge of the Deen. In fact, the Shari'ah has forbidden delving into those matters which are useless and irrelevant. The Nabi of Allah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"From the excellence of a man's Islam, is his avoidance of what does not concern him."*

A person asked Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib some questions regarding the Ta'ziyah ceremony and related matters. Amongst them, the twelfth question, regarding the martyrs of Karbala, Allah be pleased with them, was: "After martyrdom, which blessed heads were sent to Damascus and which were returned?" In answer to this, the

aforementioned Mawlawi Sahib wrote: "It says in a hadith that the excellence of a man's Islam is to leave irrelevant matters." The complete fatwa of Khan Sahib in which this question and answer is included was printed and published several times in various places, and its original with his seal and handwriting is preserved with me, and if here as in all his fatwas, full attention was given to its [correct] transmission as I have heard, then most probably here too its transmission is preserved. There is no date on the fatwa, and on the cover, besides the seal of the Daak Khana, nothing else is clear. After some deliberation, I concluded, based on overwhelming conjecture, that this fatwa was sent from Bareli to Daak Khana in October of 1920 – and Allah knows best!

From this fatwa of Khan Sahib, it is clearly understood that there is even some knowledge that is irrelevant or useless, which is better not to acquire. It is also obvious that the question in response to which Khan Sahib wrote this was not related to Zayd, 'Amr, Bakr, animals, beasts, the fish of the sea, frogs or the creepers of the earth, but the question was regarding the blessed heads of the noble Ahl-al-Bayt and the great martyrs. And in answering this, Khan Sahib said the excellence of a man's Islam is to avoid irrelevant matters.

Sixth Introductory Principle

It is possible someone lower in rank may have more extensive knowledge than one higher in rank in those sciences which are not requisites for human perfection, and which mankind were not ordered by Allah Ta'ala to attain, for example, particular daily events, and the personal and domestic affairs of particular individuals. It is possible that one despised may have more extensive knowledge in these matters than one accepted by Allah Ta'ala. In fact, in irreligious and unnecessary matters, it is possible that at times the knowledge of a person who is not a Nabi is more than a Nabi's knowledge *(i.e. knowledge of futility)*. However, in the sciences of the Shari'ah, essential matters and the Deen, the Nabi's knowledge is always more vast, because in the transmission of those sciences they (the Ambiya) are the greatest medium for the entire nation, and it is through them that these sciences reach the community. Imam Fakhr al-Din al-Razi (Rahmatullah alayh) wrote in *al-Tafsir al-Kabir*:

"It is possible that a non-Nabi is higher than a Nabi in sciences on which his Nubuwwat does not depend. (5:495)

Seventh Introductory Principle

Lack of knowledge of matters unrelated to the Deen in no way whatsoever diminishes the elevated status of the noble Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and of the other *Maqbool (Accepted)* servants of Allah Ta'ala. Such lack of awareness does not detract from the perfection of their knowledge. In fact, the idea that lack of such knowledge which is unrelated to the Deen and unnecessary for the elevated ranks of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) diminishes their lofty status is ludicrous, foolish and demonstrates the gross ignorance of the one who entertains such a baseless notion regarding the elevated position of Nubuwwat.

'Allamah Qadi 'Iyad, who had such love and devotion for the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which is worthy of emulation, in explaining this point, wrote in *al-Shifa'*:

"Regarding such sciences which are related to the mundane affairs of the material world, infallibility is not a condition with respect to the Ambiya,...... There is no defect in them in this *(i.e. in being unaware of such sciences).* Their aspiration is the life hereafter, and their concern pertains to matters of the Shari'ah, while the affairs of the world are in conflict with these lofty objectives. They are unlike others whose focus is on only this world, and about whom the Qur'aan states: *"They*

know the zaahir (the superficial, outward dimension) of the worldly life, and are unaware of the afterlife." (Qur'an 30:7) (Al-Shifa, p. 254)

Then, after supporting this statement with a number of noble hadiths, he wrote on page 302:

"Unawareness of the affairs of the world which do not concern the science of the Deen, nor its beliefs, nor its teachings, is possible for him (Rasulullah – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) since this does not bring about any defect or demotion in his lofty status. Such mundane issues are known to those who experience them and who are concerned about them. They make it their occupation. The heart of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), however, was filled with gnosis *(Ma'rifat of Allah Ta'ala)* and his soul was brimming with the sciences of the Shari'ah." (*Shifa' Qadi 'Iyad*, p. 302)

Thus, if knowledge of mundane matters which are unrelated to the Deen is acquired by a person who is not a Nabi while the Nabi has not acquired it, there is no resultant defect in the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) have no specific relationship with these worldly matters. This is why the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*You are more learned in the affairs of your world."* (*Sahih Muslim*)

This narration of *Sahih Muslim* is an extremely clear and glittering proof for our stance. Furthermore, he said: *"When it is something from the matter of your world, you are more learned about it. And when it is something from the matter of your religion, [refer it] to me."* Ahmad and Muslim narrated it from Anas, and Ibn Majah from Anas and 'A'ishah, and Ibn Khuzaymah from Abu Qatadah. (*Kanz al-'Ummal,* 6:116)

Eighth Introductory Principle

If a low-ranking person has the knowledge of some particular events and a higher-ranking one does not possess it, or a follower possesses it while the Nabi does not, it cannot be said that the follower is 'more knowledgeable.' For example, the information related to the technology and scientific inventions of today acquired by an atheist of Europe, was certainly not acquired by Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) and Imam Malik (Rahmatullah alayh).

The knowledge in inventing a gramophone which was possessed by its non-Muslim inventor was certainly not possessed by the noble Hazrat Ghawth (Rahmatullah alayh). However, which idiot will dare to say that because of these material and worldly

matters, those atheists of Europe are more knowledgeable than Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh), Imam Malik (Rahmatullah alayh) and Shaykh 'Abd al-Qadir al-Jilani (Rahmatullah alayh)?

The knowledge related to cinema and theatre *(and to making pork gelatine, re-cycling sewage water, making gambling machines and millions of other futile and sinful items –Mujlisul Ulama)* possessed by a sinful and wicked person, nay a disbeliever and a polytheist clown *(and the music of the coons of Cape Town – Mujlisul Ulama)*, was certainly not acquired by any great Allah-fearing person. Can any obfuscator say that every showman/clown is more knowledgeable than the Scholar (of Deen)? The knowledge that criminals possess regarding their crimes did not even dawn on the revered Ulama of the Deen. Is every thief, robber, pickpocket and drunkard entitled to claim superiority in knowledge to an Aalim of the Deen on the basis of his knowledge of crime and debauchery (which the Ulama and Auliya do not possess)?

Furthermore, is it not a reality that filth-eating insects *(and the devourers of halaalized carrion and pork, and the consumers of liquor, and the consumers of human urine and faeces – Mujlisul Ulama)* have more knowledge of the taste of filth

which every honourable human being is unaware of? So is now every insect more knowledgeable than human beings?

Anyhow, it is a self-evident principle that a person cannot be called "more knowledgeable" merely because he possesses more knowledge in such sciences which are unrelated to the Deen and which have no bearing on human perfection.

("More knowledgeable" is a relative issue. One being can most certainly be more knowledgeable than another being, be that being a Nabi, in a particular field, as all the aforementioned examples testify. – Mujlisul Ulama)

Ninth Introductory Principle

In the Qur'an and Hadith, many examples can be found in the life of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) where he became aware of many particular events as a result of information provided by others. Several examples are given below:

1. In the Battle of Tabuk, 'Abd Allah ibn Ubayy, the hypocrite said: "Do not spend upon those who are with the Messenger of Allah." (Qur'an 63:7) Furthermore, in that gathering he also said: "Indeed if we return to Madinah, the honourable ones will expel the despicable ones." (Qur'an 63:8)

These evil statements were heard by Hazrat Zayd ibn Arqam (Radhiyallahu anhu), and he related it to his uncle who mentioned it to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Nabi (Alayhis salaam) summoned 'Abd Allah ibn Ubayy and his companions, and asked them for an explanation. Those hypocrites swore an oath that they did not make the statements. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) believed them and rejected the claim of Zayd ibn Arqam (Radhiyallahu anhu). Zayd said: "A depression overcame me the like of which had never afflicted me. I avoided coming out of the house. Then Allah Ta'ala revealed the first verses of Surah Munafiqun. Thus, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was apprized of the truth that indeed the hypocrites had made the offensive remarks. Then, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) summoned me and recited the verses unto me, and he said, '*Verily, Allah has vouchsafed your truthfulness.'"* (*Sahih al-Bukhari*, *Kitab al-Tafsir*)

2. In regards to some hypocrites, it says in Surah Tawbah: *"And among those Bedouins who are around you there are hypocrites, and among the people of Madinah as well. They are adamant on hypocrisy. You do not know them. We know them." (9:101)* It is understood from this verse that in the era of the Nubuwwat in Madinah itself and

surrounding areas, there were such hypocrites regarding whom Allah Ta'ala said: "O beloved! You do not know them." And it is obvious that those hypocrites themselves had knowledge of their own hypocrisy.

3. "Among men there is one whose speech, in this life, attracts you. He even makes Allah his witness on what is in his heart, while he is extremely quarrelsome." (2:204) In *Tafsir Ma'alim al-Tanzil* and *Tafsir Khazin* and others it is mentioned that this verse was revealed regarding Akhnas ibn Shariq al-Thaqafi. In appearance, this person was very handsome and he possessed a very glib tongue. He came before the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and pretended to be a Muslim. He displayed considerable affection, and even took an oath by Allah. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) maintained close companionship with him, yet al-Akhnas was a hypocrite. *Tafsir Khazin* says: "It was revealed about him, *'Among men there is one whose speech attracts you,'* i.e. he pleases you and you approve of him and he is exalted in your heart." (*Khaazin*, 1:161) From this verse and the reason for its revelation, it is understood that the inward condition of Akhnas ibn Shariq was hidden from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is obvious that this wretched person certainly knew his own condition.

4. Similarly, regarding a group of the hypocrites, it was said to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): *"And if you see them, their physical bodies would attract you, and if they speak, you would listen to their speech" (63:4)* In *Tafsir Khaazin* and *Tafsir Ma'alim al-Tanzil* under the exegesis of "if they speak, you would listen to their speech," it says: "Meaning, you think that he spoke the truth."

From these three verses it is known that in the blessed time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), in the Holy City itself, there were some evil hypocrites whose hypocrisy or the degree of their hypocrisy was unknown to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). On the basis of their outward conduct and appearance, he assumed them to be pious, and he believed their lies to be true, yet those wicked people were certainly aware of their own condition although afterwards through the means of revelation, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was made aware.

5. I shall present only one more verse in this regard. Allah Ta'ala states: *"We have not taught him poetry, nor is it fitting for him." (Qur'an 36:69)* From this verse it is very clearly understood that he was not granted knowledge of poetry, yet such knowledge was acquired by even the disbelievers.

Anyhow, the Qur'an attests to the reality that knowledge of some unnecessary matters and matters unrelated to the affairs of Nubuwwat were not granted to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), while it was acquired by others, even idolaters and disbelievers. It is indeed extremely ludicrous, deviation and downright stupid to say that others who have such knowledge of mundane issues have more comprehensive knowledge than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Thousands of such incidents could be found in the Ahaadith. Here only a few Ahaadith will be presented briefly by way of example:

1. In *Sahih al-Bukhari*, *Sahih Muslim* and *Sunan Abi Dawud*, it is narrated from Hazrat Abu Hurayrah (Radhiyallahu anhu) that a black woman would usually sweep the Musjid. One day Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not find her, so he asked about her condition. He was told that she had passed away. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "Why did you not inform me? Show me her grave." They guided him to her grave and he prayed over her.

It is known from this hadith that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was unaware of this woman's demise, whilst the Sahabah (Radhiyallahu anhum) were aware. Moreover, the Sahabah even

showed Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the whereabouts of her grave.

2. In *Sunan al-Nasa'i*, it is narrated from Hazrat Zayd ibn Thabit that he said: "One day we went out with Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His gaze fell upon a new grave, and he said: 'What is this (meaning, whose grave is it)?' He was told it is the grave of such-and-such a person from such-and-such a tribe and he died in the afternoon. Since Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was that day taking an afternoon nap and he was also fasting, they did no deem it appropriate to wake him. Then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stood up and formed rows with the people behind him. Then he (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) supplicated at the grave. Then he said: 'Whilst I am among you, whenever someone dies, inform me because my supplication is a mercy for him.'"

This narration too, confirms our claim with clarity.

3. In *Sahih al-Bukhari* and the four *Sunan*s, it is narrated from Hazrat Jabir (Allah be pleased with him) that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) buried the martyrs of Uhud in pairs within separate graves, and while preparing the graves he would ask the people: "Which of the two had memorised more of the Qur'an". When one of them was pointed out, he would put him inside the grave first.

4. In *Sahih Muslim* and *Sunan al-Nasa'i*, it is narrated from Hazrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) that the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) heard some sound from a certain grave and he said: "When did this one die?" They said: "He died in the time of [pre-Islamic] ignorance," and he was pleased by this [news].

5. In *Musnad Ahmad* and *Musnad al-Bazzar*, it is narrated from Hazrat 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) that in one battle Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was brought some cheese, so he asked: "Where was this made?" They said: "In Persia."

6. In *Sunan Abu Dawud* and *Jami*' *al-Tirmidhi*, it is narrated from Abyad ibn Hammaal that he came before Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and requested him to assign him [the mines of] salt as fief at Marib. So he assigned it to him. When he returned, a man in the meeting asked: "Do you know what you have assigned him as fief, O Messenger of Allah? You have assigned him the perennial spring water." Thereupon, he took it back from him.

From this narration it is known that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) initially did not know the special quality of this land, and because of his unawareness, he assigned it to Abyad ibn Hammaal.

But after the Sahabi informed him, he became aware of the quality of that land, that it is a place for public benefit, so he repossessed it.

7. In *Sahih al-Bukhari*, *Sahih Muslim* and *Jami*' *al-Tirmidhi*, it is narrated from Hazrat 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) that "Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) went to relieve himself, and I brought a water jug for the him (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for performing wudu. When he came out, he asked: 'Who put this [here]?' When he was informed, he said: 'O Allah! Give him understanding in deen and teach him [correct] interpretation.'"

From this narration it is known that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was made aware of the identity of the one who brought the water.

8. In *Sunan Abi Dawud*, it is narrated from Abu Hurayrah (Radhiyallahu anhu) that: "I was feverish in the Musjid when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) approached. When he entered the Musjid and asked: 'Who has seen the Dawsi lad [meaning, Abu Hurayrah]?' three times, a man said: 'O Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)! He is that feverish one at the side of the Musjid ". Then he approached, walking, until he reached me and placed his hand on me."

From this narration it is clear that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was unaware of Hazrat Abu Hurayrah’s presence in the Musjid. Only after being informed by another individual did Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) become aware of this.

9. In *Musannaf ibn Abi Shaybah*, it is narrated from ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn al-Azhar: “I saw Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the Year of The Conquest while I was a young lad, asking about [the whereabouts of] the house of Khalid ibn al-Walid.”

10. In *Sahih al-Bukhari*, *Sahih Muslim*, *Sunan al-Nasa’i* and *Sunan Abi Dawud*, it is narrated from Hazrat ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) that Khalid ibn al-Walid informed him that he entered with Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) upon Maymunah, the wife of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). She was his (Khalid’s) maternal aunt and also the maternal aunt of Ibn ‘Abbas, and he found near her a roasted lizard which her sister Hafidah bint al-Harith brought from Najd. She offered the lizard to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rarely would he move his hand towards food until he was told about it and it was identified for him. So when Allah’s Rasul (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) lowered his hand to the lizard, a woman who was present said: “Inform Rasulullah

(Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) what you have offered him." They said: "It is a lizard, O Messenger of Allah." So Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) lifted his hand.

From this narration it is known that when the food was presented to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he was unaware that it was a lizard.

11 Al-Tabrani in *al-Mu'jam al-Kabir* narrated from Hazrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu) that once he had some poor quality dates which he sold in exchange for good quality dates for half its weight. When he brought them to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he said "To this day I have not seen such good quality dates, how did you come by this O Bilaal?" So he (Bilaal) explained what he had done. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "Go, and return it to its [previous] owner [as it was a riba transaction]."

12 In *Musannaf 'Abd al-Razzaq*, it is narrated from Hazrat Abu Sa'id al-Khudri (Radhiyallahu anhu) that once Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) came to one of his wives. There he saw some excellent quality dates, so he asked: "How did you come by this?" They said: "We exchanged two *sa'* for one *sa'*," so he said: "There is no two *sa'* for one *sa'* and no two dirhams for one dirham [i.e. it is interest, so return it]."

From these two narrations it is known that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) became aware of these two impermissible transactions after being informed by others.

13. Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated in his *Musannaf* and Imam Ahmad in his *Musnad* and Abu Nu'aym in his *Kitab al-Ma'rifah* from Hazrat 'Abd Allah ibn Salam; and 'Abd al-Razzaq from Abu Umamah al-Bahili; and Ibn Jarir from Ibn Sa'idah, that when the verse *"In it are men who love to cleanse themselves: and Allah loves those who purify (themselves)" (9:108)*, was revealed with respect to the people of Quba, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) summoned the people of Quba and asked them: "What is the purification for which you have been specified in this verse?" And in some narrations: "And what is your purification?" And in some of them: "Verily Allah has praised you greatly regarding purification."

14. In *Sahih Muslim*, *Jami' al-Tirmidhi*, *Sunan Abi Dawud* and *Sunan al-Nasa'i*, it is narrated from Hazrat Jabir (Radhiyallahu anhu) that a slave came to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and pledged allegiance to migrate [to Madinah]. He was unaware that the man was a slave. Thereupon, his master came to claim him. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to him: "Sell him to me." He

bought him for two black slaves. He did not accept allegiance from anybody thereafter until he inquired whether he was a slave or not.

15. In *Sahih al-Bukhari*, *Jami*' *al-Tirmidhi* and *Sunan Abi Dawud*, it is narrated from Hazrat Zayd ibn Thabit that: "He [i.e. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered me to learn Syriac[22], and he took oath by Allah that he does not trust the writing of the Jews. Half a month had not passed before I learnt Syriac, and I gained a particular skill therein. Then it was I who wrote letters to the Jews on behalf of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and it was I who read to him their letters."

The danger of the Jews was due to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) not being versed in the Syriac language, the knowledge of which was possessed by the Jews. Although, to support this claim, it is enough that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was unlettered (*ummi*) which is established from the Qur'an, I, nevertheless, quoted this narration as it is a practical explanation of his *(Ummi)* attribute. Thus, there is no room for interpretation.

[22] In Madinah, only Jews knew the Syriac language. If any letter came in the Syriac language, they would read it to him (Allah bless him and grant him peace), and if he had to send a letter, they would write it for him. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

From these five verses and fifteen Ahaadith, it is established that during the time of Nubuwwat, there were many particular events of which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was unaware while others had knowledge thereof. But simply because of such knowledge which was unrelated to matters of the Deen and the obligations of Nubuwwat, it cannot be said they were more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), nor can it be said that because of the unawareness of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) of such matters there was some deficiency in his perfect knowledge.

'Allamah Sayyid Mahmud al-Alusi, the Mufti of Baghdad (Rahmatullah alayh), wrote in his unparalleled exegesis, *Ruh al-Maani*:

I do not believe in the loss of perfection with lack of knowledge of particular worldly matters, like the lack of knowledge in what Zayd is doing for example in his house and what transpires in his day and his morrow. (*Ruh al-Ma'ani*, 8:35)

Tenth Introductory Principle

If Zayd had knowledge of a thousand things, and 'Amr of hundreds of thousands and millions of things, but within the thousand facts of information

of Zayd there are ten or twenty such facts which were not acquired by ‘Amr, then Zayd cannot be unrestrictedly be called “more knowledgeable than ‘Amr.” Indeed it can be said that Zayd has such-and-such knowledge which ‘Amr does not have. For example, Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) had acquired millions of facts of the Shari‘ah, and Ibn Rushd too was especially gifted in the sciences of Shari‘ah, but did not have even a hundredth of the knowledge of Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifah. However the knowledge of Greek philosophy which Ibn Rushd acquired was certainly not acquired by Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) because in his time Greek philosophy had not been translated into Arabic. But because of this it cannot be said Ibn Rushd was more knowledgeable than Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh).

Similarly, Hazrat Imam al-Shafi‘i (Rahmatullah alayh), Imam Ahmad (Rahmatullah alayh) and Imam Muslim (Rahmatullah alayh) had acquired thousands of facts of the Book and Sunnah, but in the field of history and biographies the knowledge possessed by Ibn Khaldun and Ibn Khallikan was certainly not possessed by them, because within the knowledge of Ibn Khallikan and Ibn Khaldun were many historical events which occurred after

the death of those Imams. No historian of today can say that Ibn Khallikan and Ibn Khaldun were more knowledgeable than those Imaams of the Deen.

Based on this, the knowledge that a driver possesses regarding driving and the information regarding shoe-making acquired by a cobbler were certainly not acquired by Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, but in my view, even the highest-ranking idiot will not dare say that because of this, the driver and cobbler have more extensive knowledge than the aforementioned Khan Sahib.

Anyhow, whenever a person is called "more knowledgeable" with respect to another person, it is only in terms of the totality of sciences, and specifically in terms of religious and Shar'i sciences. If any person concedes Zayd's expertise in any specific science, but does not accept this for 'Amr, it is not a necessary consequence thereof that he has accepted Zayd as more knowledgeable than 'Amr, unless that science is from the lofty sciences. especially when the aforementioned person accepts thousands and millions of sciences

Ten introductory principles have been presented. Here I end this section and I turn my attention to the original discussion. It is unfortunate that first in addressing this matter too, I am forced to lament

the dishonesty of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib. If this Khan Sahib, in quoting the passages of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* and in explaining its meaning, did not commit deceit, the need for adopting such a lengthy answer would have been obviated.

In *al-Baraahin al-Qat'iah*, neither was the discussion on the issue of comprehensive absolute knowledge, nor was the discussion on the superior, perfect sciences. Rather, the discussion was only about the knowledge related to the world. A like-minded partner of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami' Sahib, after proving this extent of knowledge for Satan and the Angel of Death in his book *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah* with proofs, analogised Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with them, and based on this analogy, he affirmed expansive knowledge of the world for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh), the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, refuted this analogy. *Al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* is a reply to *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*.

Anyhow, the entire discussion in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* was about expansive knowledge of the world, which has no connection with the Deen and Ibaadat, the obligations of Nubuwwat and Risaalat. Regarding such sciences, I quoted the statement of

Imam al-Razi (Rahmatullah alayh) under the sixth introductory principle from his *al-Tafsir al-Kabir* that in these sciences "it is possible that a non-Nabi is more knowledgeable than a Nabi."[23]

However, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, with his "revivalist" shenanigans, wrote: "He stated clearly in his book *al-Baraahin al-Qat'iah* that their master, Iblis, has more expansive knowledge than the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace)."

It should be considered carefully: There is a vast difference between comprehensive worldly knowledge, and comprehensive absolute knowledge?

To make it easy for readers, I will present an illustration, by which the passages from *al-Baraahin al-Qat'iah* will become completely clear.

Suppose that like the author of *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*, for example Zayd, claims that Rasulullah (Sallallahu

---

[23] Likewise within the eighth introductory principle, with extremely clear evidences, I proved that if in these sciences somebody had more expansive knowledge, he cannot be considered more knowledgeable in absolute terms in relation to another. When someone is called "more knowledgeable" in relation to another that would be said in terms of the perfecting sciences and the totality of knowledge, as was established in the last introductory principles. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

alayhi wasallam) had acquired knowledge of poetry, and as his proof for this claim, he argues that many sinners and disbelievers possess knowledge of this craft. Imra’ al-Qays was an evil disbeliever, yet he was a sophisticated poet. Al-Firdawsi was a heretical Shiite, yet one of the best Persian poets. Thus, since even sinners and disbelievers have acquired knowledge of this craft, and since Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is noblest of the Ambiya, he must have acquired it. In response to this, someone following the same methodology as Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib says:

The condition of Imra’ al-Qays and al-Firdawsi is known by recurrent historical attestations. Now, to analogise Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with them, and conclude that equivalent or greater knowledge for him is established, is not the job of any sane person of knowledge.

Firstly, the issues of Imaan are not established by analogy (Qiyaas). Beliefs are absolute and are established by absolute texts. Even solitary reports (*Khabr-e-Waahid)* are of no use here. No attention can be accorded to corrupt analogy.

Secondly, the opposite is established in the Qur’an and hadith. In the Qur’an it says: *“We have not taught him poetry, nor is it fitting for him.” (Qur’an*

36:69) It is narrated in the books of Hadith that Rasulullah (Sallahu alayhi wasallam) in his entire lifetime never recited one full poem, and in the famous book of Hanafi jurisprudence, *Fatawa Qadi Khan*, it says: "Some scholars have said: 'Whoever said, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) recited poetry,' has disbelieved."

Thirdly, if this was a basis for superiority, then every pious Muslim should be a better poet than Imra' al-Qays and al-Firdawsi. If by looking at the condition of Imra' al-Qays and al-Firdawsi, using merely corrupt analogy, knowledge of poetry is established for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), in contradiction of absolute texts texts, it will most certainly be heresy. The comprehensive knowledge of poetry of Imra' al-Qays and al-Firdawsi is known by historical testimony. Which absolute text (in the Qur'aan or Hadith) confirms the comprehensive knowledge of poetry of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

Some spiritual offspring of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib gave the fatwa:

This person in his statement has stated clearly that Imra' al Qays and al-Firdawsi have more knowledge than the Nabi (Allah bless him and grant him peace)...and indeed it says in *Nasim al-Riyad*:

"Whoever says, so-and-so is more learned than him (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace), indeed he has faulted him and degraded him, so he is an insulter."[24]

The fair and unbiased reader will not fail to understand that this mufti committed deception. The passage which he has quoted does not in any way relate to absolute knowledge or to the lofty and transcendental sciences of moral and spiritual excellence and perfection. It appears that this 'mufti' had predicated comprehensive absolute knowledge or knowledge of the lofty sciences of moral and spiritual perfection to Imra' al-Qays and Firdawsi.

Hazrat Mawlana Khalil at no stage negated or denied comprehensive absolute knowledge for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Nor did he deny the sciences pertaining to Nubuwwat There is not even a hint of such denial in the passage cited above. Only the science of poetry was discussed. Based on the acceptance of the fact that a disbeliever like Imra' al-Qays, al-Firdawsi and others were experts of poetry, and negating it

[24] The abovementioned quote is the same as that of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan, but to accord with the illustration, instead of Iblis, the names of Imra' al-Qays and al-Firdawsi were written.

(expertise in comprehensive poetry) from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), to draw the conclusion that he (Hazrat Mawlana Khalil) asserted a disbeliever like Imra’ al-Qays and a deviant like al-Firdawsi have more extensive knowledge than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the handiwork of an imposter and a schemer who, in order to justify his own inanity creates discord amongst the Muslims, or it is the work of an ignoramus and idiot who does not even understand the meaning of “more knowledgeable” and “more expansive knowledge.”

In the ten introductory principles, I have established that one will be more knowledgeable with respect to another in terms of the lofty perfecting sciences and the totality of knowledge; otherwise it would entail that it is correct to say that a cobbler, and a driver, in fact, filth-eating insects are more knowledgeable than Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib. The details of this have passed in the eighth and tenth principles.

For people of understanding, this much is enough. However, such unfortunate groups existed in the past who were extremely ignorant, and even the ‘ulama’ (i.e. among the Bid’atis) were not less in ignorance than these groups of ignoramuses

(among the masses). On the contrary, their ignorance is worse. I shall, therefore, present one more example for further clarity.

Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib told a tale of a strange and wonderful owl: Khan Sahib said:

Three people on a journey, from considerable distance saw a gathering of many people in a jungle. A chief was sitting on a saddle. His courtiers were present. One vile woman was dancing. A candle was burning. One person from the three was very experienced in archery. They told each other that this gathering of sin and wickedness should be ended. What plan should they execute [i.e. what should the archer target]? One said to kill the chief because he was responsible for everything. A second suggested killing the dancing woman. The third one said, 'Don't kill this one either, because she did not come of her own accord, but came under instructions from the chief, and as the aim was to end the gathering, the candle should be extinguished. This opinion was accepted. He aimed above the candle and shot the arrow. The candle was extinguished. Now, neither the chief remained, nor the vile woman, nor the gathering. They were extremely surprised. They stayed for the rest of the night. When it was morning, they saw a dead owl

with the arrow in its beak. It was understood that all this work was done by the soul of that owl.[25]

Now, suppose that a disciple of Khan Sahib, who believes Khan Sahib is a hadith-scholar, exegete, jurist, sufi, hafiz and reciter, but says that A'la Hazrat [a title used by his followers for Ahmad Raza Khan] was not skilled in mesmerism while another disciple says that A'la Hazrat did have experience in mesmerism, and the proof he presented is: the abovementioned episode narrated by A'la Hazrat. The reasoning being that the owl was so adept in the science of mesmerism that with one glance it enacted an extraordinary dramatic scenario, while our A'la Hazrat, the reviver of religion, who is a great and accepted slave of Allah Ta'ala was certainly thousands, nay millions, of times superior to that owl, so why should he not possess expertise in mesmerism?

Refuting this argument, the other disciple says that the owl's expertise in mesmerism is known from the narration of A'la Hazrat, but there is no basis for establishing A'la Hazrat's expertise in mesmerism, and analogising an owl with A'la Hazrat is a corrupt analogy.

---

[25] Khan Sahib related this story when explaining the reality of Mesmerism. See *Malfuzat*, Part Four, Hasani Press, Bareli. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

Will it now be proper for some disciple of Khan Sahib to claim that the other disciple degraded the knowledge of A'la Hazrat by saying that an owl has more extensive knowledge than A'la Hazrat, the great 'reviver' of religion?[26] Indeed, it should be quite simple to understand that this conclusion is absolute drivel. If on the basis of such nonsense the disciple is expelled from the Raza Khani brethren, knowing well that it is devious propaganda fabricated against him, then it would be the most despicable of deceit and deception.

Anyhow, Khan Sahib's first deception was that:

Al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah discussed the vastness of one particular science, that is, knowledge regarding the world. Mawlawi Abd al-Sami who is the ilk of Mawlawi Ahmed Raza Khan had with proofs predicated such knowledge for Shaitaan and Malakul Maut. Then on the basis of Rasulullah's superiority he affirmed such knowledge for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The author of *al-Baraahin* refuted this corrupt analogy. *(It is indeed a corrupt and ludicrous analogy to attribute a certain type of knowledge to Rasulullah –*

---

[26] This is what Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's disciples and followers say. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

Sallallahu alayhi wasallam on the basis of Shaitaan's awareness.)

Furthermore, in expressions of the author of *Al-Baraahin* (i.e. Hazrat Maulana Khalil), such words are present that restrict the discussion to knowledge of the world. For example, on page 47 of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, the page from which Khan Sahib quoted, these words are found at its beginning:

In sum, it should be carefully considered, that by looking at the condition of Satan and the Angel of Death, to affirm ***encompassing knowledge of the world*** for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in conflict with explicit texts (of the Qur'aan and Hadith) without any proofs besides corrupt analogy, <u>if not *shirk* then which part of faith is it?</u>

In this sentence, ***"encompassing knowledge of the world"*** is present. This statement eliminates any doubt or confusion. However, Khan Sahib's dishonesty can be understood from the fact that in *Husaam al-Haramayn*, he quotes the last underlined part of this sentence, and omits the first part where ***encompassing knowledge of the world*** is clearly mentioned. Despite this, such titles as "reviver of the current century," "defender of the pure faith"

etc. etc. are given to him. *(Awarded to the Bid'ati by his moron grave-worshipping followers. – Mujlisul Ulama)*

Furthermore, here, another deception of the same kind is observed. Exactly two lines before the passage which Khan Sahib quoted on that page, the sentence begins as follows:

Thus, merely on the basis of the lofty status of the Blessed Soul (i.e. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the highest (heavenly realm of) 'Illiyyin, and because of his superiority to the Angel of Death, it can not be affirmed that his knowledge <u>in these matters</u> are equal to the Angel of Death, or in excess to him.

In this passage too, the phrase "these matters" clearly explains that the discussion is only about knowledge regarding the world, not knowledge in general, nor the lofty sciences of perfection on which human virtue, moral and spiritual progress depend. But Khan Sahib also clearly omitted this sentence.

(The issue which the Bid'ati molvi has obfuscated is quite simple. The chief of the Qabar Pujaaris, Raza Khan with his rigmarole of deception has deceitfully laboured to create the abhorrent notion that

Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Saharanpuri had claimed that Malakul Maut had more knowledge in general than Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This is a fallacious and a slanderous charge against Hadhrat Maulana Khalil.

Every Muslim understands that Malakul Maut is in charge of the deaths of all people. He has total knowledge in this regard, namely, who is to die when and where and how. It comes in the Hadith that all mankind is in front of Malakul Maut just as a plate of food is in front of a person.

On the Night of Mi'raaj, when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw Malakul Maut in action, engrossed in his duties of commanding the deaths of people, he (Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) enquired from Jibraeel (alayhis salaam) about this Being. Who was he? Hadhrat Jibraeel (alayhis salaam) informed that this was Israaeel, the Angel of Death. From this episode it is abundantly clear that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was not even aware of the Angel in whose presence he was. To a far greater degree was Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) unaware of the multitudes of people who are being earmarked for death every moment.

But, Malakul Maut has this knowledge. Thus, to say that Malakul Maut has more knowledge than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the matter of the deaths of people, never ever implies degradation or belittling of that vast and comprehensive knowledge in general which Allah Ta'ala had bestowed to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is only minds incorrigibly convoluted with stercoral matter, and driven into inanity in proximity to insanity, which intransigently maintain otherwise.

However, the rationale underlying the Bid'ati gang's inanity, stupidity and spiritual debauchery is not ignorance. It is because of humbug. It is not because the Bid'ati chap did not understand what he was reading in Baraahin-e-Qaatiah of Hadhrat Khalil Saharanpuri. The issue is blind and malicious animosity. Since the Ulama of Deoband by their dissemination of the Haqq and the Sunnah were curtailing the monetary objectives of the Qabar Pujaaris, these Kilaabun Naar (Dogs of the Fire) retaliated in this manner of fabricating falsehood and attributing glaring and slanderous LIES to the august Ulama of Deoband. There is really no conundrum in this vile attitude of the Qabar Puja sect.—Mujlisul Ulama of S.A.)

Anyhow, despite all these clear statements from *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, by which it is clearly understood that here the discussion is only about encompassing knowledge of the world *(and that too of a specific type)*, and not absolute knowledge in general, Khan Sahib writes:

He stated clearly in his book *al-Baraahin al-Qat'iah*...that their master, Iblis, has more expansive knowledge than the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace).

Thus far, an explanation of Khan Sahib's first deception was presented, and his first objection has been satisfactorily answered. There remains no scope for doubt for an unbiased person. In fact not even for a biased and fanatical person. So all praise is due to Allah!

The upshot of the answer is that in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, based on those evidences which Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami' Sahib, the author of *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah* presented, only comprehensive knowledge of the world is conceded for Satan and the Angel of Death, and that ***such*** knowledge is not confirmed by textual evidence for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Interpreting this as rejection of the comprehensive and absolute knowledge bestowed to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and

concluding that he (Maulana Khalil) said that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had lesser knowledge than Satan's, is only the work of an ignorant and foolish person who restricts the lofty knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to the lower material world. But for the person who believes that his (Rasulullah's) knowledge is higher than the Arsh and the Kursi, it is not possible to entertain such an absurd, stupid and vile notion.

If someone says that in the science of architecture, the knowledge possessed by some English or European person, is more than the knowledge of Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) in this field, not even a moron will understand that this person has claimed that Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifah's (Rahmatullah alayh) knowledge is less than the knowledge of the disbelieving Englishman. Likewise if someone says that a certain drunkard has much knowledge pertaining to wine, while a certain Ghawth or Qutb lacks such knowledge, it will never be understood from this that the person believes the drunkard to be more knowledgeable than the Ghawth or Qutb.

The truth is that in order to misguide people, the means and ways which Satan required were all

granted to him by the Allah Azza Wa Jal, in order to test humanity. He gave him life till Resurrection. He gave him such strange and extraordinary powers that he is able to traverse man's vessels just like blood. The knowledge that is needed to misguide the slaves of Allah was all given to him, so that he may accomplish his pernicious objectives, and so that the world realises how futile his weapons and snares are against the true Slaves of Allah Ta'ala.

For the requisites for his satanic mission, essential for the misguidance of mankind, he has been given the knowledge of their passions and desires. He should know that in a place there is a young woman alone and a wandering youth can reach there with a certain plan. He has to be aware of the dens of vice and evil to ply his trade of deception and immorality. The lofty Souls (the Ambiya and Auliya) have no purpose to achieve with such knowledge pertaining to evil and futility. Their duty is to provide guidance and to teach the Truth. The lofty and pure sciences which are needed for accomplishing their holy mission were given to them in full measure by Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Thus, even if Satan has acquired some knowledge of the menial mundane world, and the revered Ambiya did not acquire it, which idiot and which

follower of Satan will say that merely because of these lower sciences, Satan is more knowledgeable than the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or any other Nabi? This does not detract from the divine sciences and the transcendental disciplines which they have acquired in such a large measure which no Mukarrab (Close to Allah) Angel has achieved.

Within the introductory principles I have shed more than enough light on this subject. I shall now present only one further issue, and with that, if Allah wills, this part of the discussion will end. I have no expectation of gaining the friendship of enemies. Yes, those whom Allah has given the ability to love truth, I certainly hope that they will accept the truth.

The Powerful Testimony of Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami‘ and Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib which Absolves Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayhi)

The decision of the accuser in my favour is better

As Zulaykha declared the innocence of the Moon of Canaan[27]

From our previous discussion it was clear that the only ‘crime’ committed by the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah* was that, based on the proofs which Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami‘ presented in *al-Anwar al-Sati‘ah*, he accepted the expanse of one particular science, meaning, knowledge of the world, for Satan and the Angel of Death, and he said this expanse was not established by text for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but:

Such a crime this is that those of your city commit it!

Shortly after this discussion, these are the words of *al-Anwar al-Sati‘ah*:

The supporters of the gathering of Milaad do not claim that the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) is present in all pure and impure, religious and irreligious, gatherings. The presence of the Angel of Death and Iblis is found in even more places than him, (in places) of purity and impurity, disbelief and belief.

Look! Even Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib did not write with such audacity and impunity. He [i.e.

[27] Meaning, the Prophet Yusuf (peace be upon him).

Mawlana Khalil Ahmad] referred to only comprehensive specific knowledge of the world which was not documented in the texts for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This like-minded brother of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, namely, Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami‘ Sahib, clearly says that the presence of the Angel of Death and Satan is in more places than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The abovementioned sentence of *al-Anwar al-Sati‘ah* was in its first edition which was printed together with *al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah*; and also in the edition which was revised by Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami and thereafter published. Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib wrote about 4 pages of commendation in which he lavishly praised Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami Sahib and his *al-Anwar al-Sati‘ah*. Therefore, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib’s successors and followers should answer:

1) Is Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami‘ a disbeliever because of this passage or not?

1) And where does Khan Sahib himself stand because of writing a commendation on it?

May Allah Ta’ala give me and you the faculty of insight. Do you see the miracle of the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah*, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad

Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh)? Khan Sahib himself was caught up in the very accusation he hurled at him.

I will now close this discussion, and I think it is appropriate as a conclusion to the discussion that I quote the statement of the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* (Rahmatullah alayh) in *al-Tasdiqaat li Daf' al-Talbisaat* [also known as *al-Muhannad 'ala al-Mufannad*] in which he answered this Satanic slander.

When Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib took the yield of his labour and efforts, i.e. the fatwa of disbelief (kufr), to the two noble Harams, and he solicited endorsements from the noble Ulama there, who were unaware of the reality of the situation, by deceiving them, and this initiated a discussion even in the two noble Harams, some of the people of knowledge sent 26 questions pertaining to beliefs to the revered Ulama of Deoband and Saharanpur. The answers to these questions were given by Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib, the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*. The answers to all 26 questions were sent to the Ulama of Haramain Shareefain, Levant, Damascus, Halab, Egypt etc. for endorsement and confirmation. These noble Ulama and senior Muftis endorsed it and declared it sound. These answers along with the endorsements were printed. Its first edition with translation was

printed as *al-Tasdiqat li Daf' al-Talbisaat* (Endorsements to Repel Distortions). Then after that, many editions of it were published.

The nineteenth answer is related to this Satanic slander of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib. I shall quote the exact question and its answer. Readers will notice that my explanation in this discussion is in fact an elaboration of this brief reply which the author of *Baraahin* himself gave during his lifetime:

Question Nineteen

Do you believe that Iblis, the accursed, is more knowledgeable than the Chief of Creation, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and that he has more comprehensive knowledge than him in absolute terms? Have you written this in a book? And how do you judge one who believes this?

Answer:

A review of this issue preceded from us, that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the most knowledgeable of creation in general, of the sciences, the judgement, the secrets and other than that from the Kingdom of the Heavens, and we believe with certainty that one who says that so-and-so person is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has disbelieved. Our elders have given the verdict of

disbelief for one who says that Iblis, the accursed, is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). So how is it possible that this matter is in a certain book we authored?

However, the concealment of some insignificant particular things from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) due to his inattention to it does not cause any defect in his (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) position as the most learned, since it is established that he is the most knowledgeable of creation in the noble sciences that are fitting to his lofty station. Similarly, cognizance of most of the menial (and mundane) issues, due to the intensity of Iblis's attention to them, does not cause glory and perfection of knowledge in him, since this is not the criterion of virtue. Therefore, it is not correct to say that Iblis is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) just as it is not correct to say about a child who knows some particulars that he is more knowledgeable than an erudite research scholar in the sciences merely on account of those particulars being hidden from him. We have recited unto you the story of Hud-hud with Sulayman (upon our Nabi and upon him be peace) and his statement, "I comprehend that which you do not comprehend." (Qur'an 27:22) The records of Hadith and the books of exegesis are replete with

abundant examples of this which are well-known amongst people[28].

The physicians are agreed that Plato and Galen and their likes are from the most knowledgeable of physicians about the qualities of diseases and their states, despite their knowledge that maggots are more knowledgeable about states of filth, their taste and their qualities. Hence, the lack of Plato's and Galen's knowledge of these despicable states does not detract from them being the most learned. No intelligent person and not even a moron will be satisfied with the view that maggots are more knowledgeable than Plato, although they have more extensive knowledge than Plato about the states of filth.

The innovators of our lands affirm for the blessed Soul of the Nabi (upon it a million greetings and peace) all the sciences of the base, lowly things and the lofty virtuous things, saying that since he (upon him be peace) was the best of all creation, it is necessary that he should possess all of those sciences, every particular and every universal. We rejected the establishment of this matter using this corrupt analogy without a proof-text from the authoritative texts. Do you not see that every believer is more virtuous and more honourable than Iblis so following this logic it would be necessary

---

[28] In the ninth introductory principle, I presented five verses with the statements of the exegetes and fifteen hadiths on this matter. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

that every person from the individuals of this *ummah* possesses the sciences of Iblis, and it would be necessary that Sulayman (upon our Nabi and upon him be peace) knew that which Hud-hud knew, and that Plato and Galen had all the knowledge of maggots? These concomitants are absurd in their entirety as is obvious.

This is a summary of what we said in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* in order to sever the veins of the foolish deviants and break the necks of the forging deceivers. Hence, our discussion about it was only in regards to some of these temporal particulars, and for this reason we used the demonstrative noun to indicate that the objective in affirmation and negation was those particulars, and nothing besides them. However, the iniquitous ones distort the speech and do not fear the reckoning of the Knowing King. We are certain that those who say that so-and-so individual is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is a disbeliever, as more than one of our respected 'Ulama stated. And whoever concocts about us that which we did not say, upon him is the burden of proof, and he should fear the interrogation before the Recompensing King. Allah is witness over what we say.

For Allah's sake, be fair! After this reply of the author of *Baraahin* himself, is there any room left for this slander? No, by Allah! Judgement will be on the Day of Judgement.

Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's Second Objection to *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*

The second substantial objection of Khan Sahib Barelwi against the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh), was that he accepted encompassing knowledge for Satan and labelled its affirmation for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) *shirk*, whereas anything which is *shirk* when affirmed for any single creature is also *shirk* when affirmed for another being. Hence, it is as though the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* accepts Satan as a partner of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

If the respected readers carefully considered this allegation, it would be realised that this objection is more erroneous and more unfounded than the first, and its reality is pure dishonesty, just as Khan Sahib's fatwas are far from honesty and integrity.

The actual truth is that in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, the affirmation of intrinsic knowledge for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was regarded as *shirk. (Intrinsic Knowledge – Knowledge not derived from any external source – Knowledge which is inherent. This Knowledge is exclusive with Allah Azza Wa Jal.).* Based on the proofs which the like-minded brother of Khan Sahib, Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami',

presented in *al-Anwar al-Sati'a*, he (i.e. Hazrat Maulana Khalil) accepted only granted knowledge for Satan. *(i.e. Such knowledge granted to him by Allah Ta'ala).* The affirmation of intrinsic knowledge necessitates *shirk* as proven from Khan Sahib's own statements, quoted in the first introductory principle.

In *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, such statements are found in different places from which it is clearly understood that only 'granted knowledge' is conceded for Satan, and *shirk* was determined for intrinsic knowledge, which Khan Sahib himself does not dispute. However, it is unfortunate that based on his "revivalist integrity," ignoring all these statements from *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, he wrote explicitly:

He believes in encompassing earthly knowledge for Iblis, and when the mention of Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace), comes, he says, "This is *shirk*." *Shirk* is only to affirm a partner for Allah Almighty, so when affirming something for any of creation is *shirk*, it will definitely be *shirk* for all creation, since it is not possible for anyone to be a partner of Allah Almighty.

I completely agree with this principle of Khan Sahib, that whatever is *shirk* to affirm for any creation will certainly be *shirk* when affirmed for any other being in this world. However, although I completely agree with this principle of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, applying it to the author of *Baraahin* is the particular act of Khan Sahib which is called deception or distortion. Apart from the difference between intrinsic and granted knowledge, here, Khan Sahib openly slandered the author of *Baraahin* saying that he accepted "encompassing knowledge" for Satan, but this is a lie that is devoid of even a trace of truth[29]. But it is unfortunate that in the Raza Khani group *(i.e. the Barelwi Qabar Pujaari sect - Mujlisul Ulama)* no truthful and uprighteous person comes to mind who will accept this revolting act of his leader as even an unintentional error, let alone deliberate deception.

The reality is that the like-minded brother of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, viz. Mawlawi 'Abd

[29] When the phrase "encompassing knowledge of the world" is mentioned in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, it is addressing the knowledge which is wrongly affirmed for the nabi (peace and blessings be upon him) based on the invalid analogy with Satan and the Angel of Death, not the knowledge that is conceded for the latter. The knowledge that is conceded for the latter is what is described in the work being refuted, *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*, quoted in the next paragraph above. Hence, the deception in Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan's comment, "He believes in encompassing earthly knowledge for Iblis," which Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani is highlighting here.

al-Sami' Sahib, in proving expansive knowledge for Satan in *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*, wrote:

In *al-Durr al-Mukhtaar* in the section of Salaah it is written that Satan stays with the sons of Aadam in the day and his children stays with the offspring of Aadam in the night. 'Allamah al-Shaami wrote in its commentary that Satan stays with all the children of Aadam except those whom Allah saves. After this he wrote: "Allah gave him this power just as He gave the Angel of Death a similar power."

Thus, whatever knowledge Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami Sahib has confirmed for Satan by such evidence, it was certainly accepted by Mawlana Khalil Sahib. If this is what Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib understands as encompassing knowledge of the world, this then is the quality *(and worthlessness – Mujlisul Ulama)* of his academic ability which can be judged by the people of knowledge.

What is the relationship between Satan's *(and the myriads of his progeny's – Mujlisul Ulama)* continuous presence with people and encompassing knowledge of world? His presence with people does not necessitate the knowledge of every leaf and every atom. *(Such limitless knowledge is the attribute of only Allah Azza Wa Jal as is confirmed by the Qur'aan: 'And by Him are the Keys of the*

Ghaib. He knows what is in the land and in the ocean. Not a leaf drops (from a tree) but He is aware. There is not a seed in the darkness of the earth nor anything moist nor anything dry, but it is recorded in a Clear Book.'

Shaitaan's worldly comprehensive knowledge does not take within its ambit the knowledge of every material particle, for such knowledge is exclusive with Allah Azza Wa Jal. His 'comprehensive' knowledge is applicable to the tricks of his trade. – Mujlisul Ulama)

And if the mind of Khan Sahib accepts this *(i.e. continuous presence)* as encompassing knowledge, even then, the first to believe in it, rather, the first to call others to believe in it, is the like-minded brother of Khan Sahib, Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami Sahib, and the first to exemplify the fatwa of *kufr* and *shirk* is him, because it was he who proved this extent of knowledge for Satan with 'proofs', while Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) only said "we accept." Anyhow, here Khan Sahib slandered the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* falsely by baselessly claiming that he believed in encompassing knowledge of the world for Iblis.

The second deception *(of the Qabar Puraari)* was that in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, based on those

evidences which Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami Sahib presented, only granted knowledge *(i.e. knowledge acquired from Allah Ta’ala)* was accepted for Satan (by Hazrat Mawlana Khalil) while he labelled intrinsic knowledge *(i.e. such eternal and limitless Knowledge which is exclusively the Attribute of Allah Azza Wa Jal)* for (Rasulullah Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), *shirk*. Khan Sahib had certainly seen this strong distinction made between intrinsic and granted knowledge. Now I will present evidence for both these matters, that granted knowledge was conceded [for Satan and the Angel of Death], and *shirk* was determined for intrinsic knowledge.

Proving the first matter

In this discussion of *al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah*, on the fortieth line of page 50, it says: “The extent of the knowledge given to Satan...” Then four lines after that, it says: “And Satan and the Angel of Death who were given this extent in knowledge...” There is clarity in these two sentences that the knowledge which was conceded for Satan was knowledge granted by Allah Ta’ala.

Proving the Second Matter

First it should be understood that the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah,* in this discussion, refutes the

logic that, since Satan and the Angel of Death have acquired this expanse in knowledge, therefore, because of the superiority of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), more knowledge of the world than this is axiomatically inherent in him. It is this assumption that the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* called *shirk*.

In the first line of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* from where this discussion begins, it says:

The entire Ummah has the belief that affirming even one iota of knowledge more than the quantity of knowledge which Allah Azza Wa Jal favoured for and imparted to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and all creation, is *shirk*. This is derived from all books of the Shari'ah.

It is known from this text that the opinion of the author of *Baraahin* is that it is only *shirk* to affirm such knowledge for creation which has not been bestowed by Allah Azza Wa Jal. Such knowledge is termed "intrinsic knowledge." In the same discussion, shortly afterwards, he said:

The belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah is that no attribute of Allah Azza Wa Jal *(in its Intrinsic eternal state)* can be found in any created being. Whatever He bestows of His attributes to man, are mere shadows. Man's attributes are in entirety reliant on

Allah Azza Wa Jal. A created attribute is not an intrinsic quality. Furthermore, there can not be even an atom's increase in whatever quantity of knowledge Allah Ta'ala has bestowed to anyone. The extent of knowledge which Satan and the Angel of Death have, cannot increase by virtue of their own ability. *(i.e. By independent acquisition.)*

Then he said:

The quantity of the knowledge of the hidden which was acquired by Hazrat Khidhr (Alayhis salaam), had been bestowed to him by Allah Azza Wa jal. Khidhr is not able to increase on it. Similarly, Hazrat Musa (Alayhis salaam) despite his superiority over Khidhr – Alayhis salaam), lacked it (i.e. the knowledge of the hidden which was bestowed to Khidhr – Alayhis salaam). Thus, Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) and Khidhr (Alayhis salaam) are equal in their inability to independently generate knowledge.

From this it should be clear that the understanding that a superior person, due to his superiority, can gain an increase in an attribute of perfection over an inferior person without the bestowal of Allah Azza Wa Jal, is incorrect. After proving this statement, the author of *Baraahin* says:

The upshot is: based on the states of Satan and the Angel of Death regarding their knowledge of the

places of the world, as is understood from the evidences of Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami' Sahib, to affirm encompassing knowledge of the world (i.e. intrinsic knowledge) for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without absolute textual evidence, but on the basis of corrupt analogy, is *shirk*. The analogy posits that since Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the most superior being in creation, he possesses intrinsic knowledge.

This expanse for Satan and the Angel of Death (meaning, with Allah's command having knowledge of many places of the world) is proven by text (meaning, those texts which Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami' Sahib presented). However, for the expansive knowledge of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – i.e. assumed intrinsic knowledge on the basis of corrupt analogy and pure opinion -- which decisive text (of the Qur'aan or Hadith) is there, on the basis of which all texts are rejected and *shirk* is established?

The end result is that the sections before and after the passage in question clearly show that the author of *Baraahin* is speaking only about intrinsic knowledge, and this is what he termed *shirk*.

Thus far, I proved my claim on the basis of implications of the context. Although these

indications are not less than clear and explicit statements, I shall, nonetheless, now present a clearer statement from the author of *Baraahin* in which, he explains with complete clarity that his discussion pertains only to intrinsic knowledge *(which is Allah's eternal, uncreated attribute),* and not to granted knowledge. In this very discussion, several sentences after the sentence quoted by Khan Sahib, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil states:

This discussion is about establishing such knowledge *(i.e. all-encompassing eternal knowledge)* for him intrinsically, as is the belief of the ignorant. If he believes that by Allah's Will Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is present, it will not be *shirk*, but without proof of Shari`ah, having this belief is incorrect. *(In other words, to believe that something is possible by the Will of Allah, is valid. But to affirm a specific state/attribute to any one without absolute proof of the Shariah, is erroneous and not permissible, despite the possibility. – Mujlisul Ulama)*

Now ponder! The author of *Baraahin* clearly explained that the ruling of *shirk* is only in the situation where any person affirms intrinsic knowledge for him (i.e. for Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In the first introductory principle, I quoted the references of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*

and *Khalis al-I'tiqad* from the statements of Khan Sahib himself that whoever affirms any share of intrinsic knowledge, even if "less than, less than" an atom for any one besides Allah, he has committed *shirk*.

Thus, Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) is not guilty of a 'crime' in which Khan Sahib does not have an equal share. And assuming this clear statement was not in *Baraahin* and these implications were not in the context which compelled us to accept the intent as intrinsic knowledge, then too, it would never have been permissible in any way for Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib to read into this place the intent of comprehensive granted knowledge. In *Khalis al-I'tiqad*, on page 28, as a general principle, he wrote:

In the verses, hadiths and statements of 'ulama which condemn the affirmation of knowledge of unseen for others, most certainly these two types (intrinsic or encompassing knowledge) are intended.

Thus in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, the knowledge which is labelled *shirk* should be understood as intrinsic or completely encompassing knowledge. *(This is the logical conclusion).* But it is unfortunate

that for the crave of *takfir*, he forgot his own written principles. It is true that:

Your love for something blinds and deafens.

Thus far, Khan Sahib's second objection has been answered, the upshot of which is that he criticised [*al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*] for describing as *shirk* the very knowledge that was affirmed for Satan whereas, the reality is contrary to this, as granted knowledge was conceded for Satan and *shirk* was applied to affirmation of intrinsic knowledge. The difference is quite evident.

Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's Third Objection against *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*

The third objection of Khan Sahib Barelwi against the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh), was that:

He demands for the knowledge of Muhammad (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) an absolute text, and he will not be satisfied with it until it is absolute (*qat'i*). However, when he comes to negating his (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) knowledge, in this explanation on page 46, six lines before this disgraceful [statement of] disbelief, he himself adheres to a baseless hadith.

Regarding the classification of the narration *(which the Bid'ati labelled baseless)*, I shall if Allah wills, explain it in the answer to the fourth objection. Here I only wish to answer Khan Sahib's academic fallacy that "he demands for affirmation *(of Rasulullah's knowledge)* an absolute text, but for negation *(of knowledge)* he presents one narration."

If only, before presenting this objection, Khan Sahib had first carefully considered the question: Did the author of *Baraahin*, present those hadiths as a claimant producing evidence, or as an objector and opponent? He should have also researched the difference between these two functions in the principles of debate.

The reality is that the author of *Baraahin* (Rahmatullah alayh) demanded an absolute text for affirmation *(i.e. for the affirmation of intrinsic knowledge to Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam).* For establishing belief, an absolute text is undoubtedly necessary. Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself accepts this in principle (see *Inba' al-Mustafa*).

However, in refutation of analogy *(qiyaas)*, let alone hadiths, even another analogy can be produced (see *Munazarah Rashidiyyah* and its commentaries).

Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's Fourth Objection against *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*

The fourth objection was that the author of *Baraahin* was deceptive in quoting, and the narration which Hazrat Shaykh 'Abd al-Haqq Muhaddith Dihlawi (Rahmatullah alayh) refuted after quoting, was quoted [by Mawlana Khalil Ahmad] while attributing it to him, and there was no mention of the refutation. Thus, it is as though he selectively quoted "Don't approach Salah" [from the Qur'an] and omitted "while you are drunk."

I ask the spiritual descendants of Khan Sahib to forgive me, as I am forced to say here that since this act *(of deception)* is normal for him, he projects this onto others, but he should know that such tactics are only requisites of the people of falsehood *(especially those who worship graves)*. The Seekers of Truth have no need for it. However, since this objection of Khan Sahib is not related to the subject of *takfir*, I shall be brief in my reply.

Firstly take note of the words used by the author of *Baraahin*. On page 51 on the seventh line he wrote:

And Shaykh 'Abd al-Haq narrates (the Hadith) that: "I do not even have knowledge of what is behind a wall."

Here the author of *Baraahin* did not give the name of any particular book of the Shaykh. So if this narration is mentioned in any book of the Shaykh without criticism and refutation then the reference of the author of *Baraahin* will be absolutely correct, and it will be understood that he quoted from there. Now take note of the last hadith of *al-Fasl al-Thaalith* of *Mishkat al-Masabih*, *Bab Sifat al-Salah*:

Narrated from Abu Hurayrah: He said: Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prayed Zuhr with us, and in the last rows was a man who ruined [his] prayer. When he made *salaam*, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) called him and said: " Do you not fear Allah? Do you not see how you pray? You think that something you do is hidden from me. By Allah! Indeed I see from behind me [in Salaah] as I see in front of me. (Ahmad narrated it)

Hazrat Shaykh 'Abd al-Haqq Dihlawi (Allah have mercy on him) while commenting on this hadith on page 392 of *Ashi'at al-Lam'at* wrote:

Know that Rasulullah's (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) vision from behind was a miraculous form (*kharq al-'adah*), by means of revelation or inspiration, and it was only an occasional feat. It was not permanent. This is supported by the hadith that when the blessed camel of Rasulullah (Sallallahu

alayhi wasallam) was lost, he did not know its whereabouts. So the hypocrites said: “Muhammad says that he receives news from the heavens, and he has no news of the whereabouts of his camel!” Then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “By Allah! I know not but what my Rabb has taught me. Now, my Rabb has informed me that it is in a certain place, and its rein is tied to the branch of a tree.” Also Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “I am a man. I do not know what is behind this wall,” meaning, without being informed by the Allah Azza Wa Jal. (*Ashi‘at al-Lam‘at*, 1:392)

Here, the Shaykh quoted the narration and did not mention any criticism of it. Therefore, the reference of Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullaah alayh) is absolutely correct. In fact if considered carefully, from this statement of the Shaykh, it is known that the narration is worthy of consideration according to him because here the Shaykh presented it to support his claim, and it is inconceivable that the Shaykh would present a narration as proof for his claim if he believed that it to be completely baseless. Thus his quotation of this narration in the context of proof is clear evidence that it is reliable according to him.

The question remains that the Shaykh in one section of *Madarij al-Nubuwwah* said regarding this

narration that "it is baseless." Although answering this question is not our responsibility, nevertheless, in order to remove confusion from the readers, I will comment briefly on it.

The reality is that even the well-known authority of Hadith, Hafiz Ibn al-Jawzi quoted this narration without its chain of transmission *(Sanad)* in some of his Kitaabs notwithstanding his meticulous appraisal of Ahaadith, expertise in this science, and deep insight. He exercised utmost caution in accepting and rejecting Hadith narrations. His citation of a narration without criticism is sufficient evidence for acceptance of the Hadith. Thus, the Shaykh (Rahmatullah alayh) accepted the narration to be reliable, and in the abovementioned passage of *Ashi'at al-Lamat* presented it as support for his claim.

However, since no chain has been transmitted for this narration, he averred in *Madarij al-Nubuwwah*, that "it is baseless," meaning, it has no chain. By this, the contradiction in the Shaykh's speech is repelled. Indeed, it is a strange coincidence that even in the appraisal of Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani regarding this very narration, there is an apparent contradiction. Thus, al-Qastallani in *al-Mawahib al-Ladunniyyah* quotes from al-Sakhawi's (Rahmatullah alayh) *al-Maqasid al-Hasanah*:

Our teacher, Shaykh al-Islam, Ibn Hajar said regarding the hadith, *"I do not know what is behind this wall of mine,* "It has no basis." However, in *Talkhis Takhrij Ahadith al-Rafi'i* commenting on al-Rafi'i's statement in *al-Khasa'is* (o*n this Hadith)*, *"And he sees from behind his back as he sees from his front"*:

"It is in the two *Sahih*s, etc. from the Hadith of Anas and others. The hadiths transmitted in this regard are restricted to the condition of Salaah, and by this it can be reconciled with his (i.e. Rasulullah's) statement: *'I do not know what is behind this wall of mine.'"* This indicates it is transmitted.

'Allamah al-Zurqaani, after quoting this passage of Hafiz al-Sakhawi (Rahmatullah alayh), said in *Sharh al-Mawahib*:

This statement, "It has no basis" is a contradiction. It is possible that by this is meant that the defect is not such which is worthy for consideration, as it was cited without chain. Therefore, it does not mean that that the narration is false.

Thus, the explanation that I gave for the apparent contradictions of the Shaykh (Rahmatullah alayh) is exactly how 'Allamah al-Zurqani explained it [the apparent contradiction] of Hafiz Ibn Hajar.

Whatever I have presented regarding the Shaykh's comment, viz. "it is baseless", was beyond my obligation. It was only my responsibility to find in a Kitaab of the Shaykh mention of this narration without criticism. This, I have shown. The narration is reliable according to him. I have eliminated the apparent contradiction between his two statements. So all praise and thanks is due to Allah!

Apart from what has been explained, there is no doubt that the narration is true in its meaning. Many authentic Ahaadith support its content. For example, in the two *Sahih*s and *Sunan al-Nasa'i*, it is narrated from Zaynab, the wife of Ibn Mas'ud (Radhiyallahu anhu), that she came to the door of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to ask a question about Zakaat. When she reached there, another Ansaari wife was standing there with the same need. Then Hazrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu) came to them and she said to him: "Go to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and inform him that two women are at the door asking: 'Is their charity permissible on behalf of their husbands and the orphans in their care,' and don't inform him who we are." So Bilaal asked him, and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to him "Who are they?" he said: "A woman from the Ansaar and Zaynab." He said to him "Which Zaynab?" He said: "The wife of 'Abdullah [ibn

Mas'ud].” He said: “For them are two rewards: the reward of [maintaining good] relations, and the reward of charity.”

Thus, if Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was aware of all matters behind a wall, what was the need for him to ask Hazrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu) about the names of the women? He furthermore, enquired, “which Zaynab?” This is clear proof that he was not aware of everything behind a wall.

Furthermore, in the last days of his life in the state of illness, in order to see his congregation, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) went to the door of his blessed chamber, and opening the curtain, he saw those praying in congregation in the Musjid. This is mentioned in the authentic Kutub. He repeatedly and specifically asked during the final days: “Are the people performing Salaat?” Yet between the Sacred Musjid and the holy chamber was only one wall. This is clear proof that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not know everything behind a wall. Thus, the narration in a hadith, “By Allah, I do not know what is behind this wall of mine”, is not at all surprising. There is nothing repulsive about it? No one can deny the correctness of the meaning of this narration.

Furthermore, if all of this ignored, every unbiased person will accept that the author of *Baraahin* presented this narration in the context of negating intrinsic knowledge, because we have established from the statements of the author of *Baraahin* himself that his entire discussion pertains to intrinsic knowledge. Thus he understood this narration as a negation of intrinsic knowledge. In fact, we have established from the statements of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib that he, himself too does not profess intrinsic knowledge for anyone besides Allah. On the contrary, whoever affirms even one atom of intrinsic knowledge for any person besides Allah or even less than less than that, he is according to him a disbeliever and polytheist. Based on this, this narration is correct in its meaning according to Khan Sahib too, and he himself has stated: "In the verses, hadiths and statements of 'ulama which condemn the affirmation of the knowledge of unseen for others, these two types (intrinsic or encompassing knowledge) are definitely intended." (*Khalis al-I'tiqad*, p. 28)

Thus, since Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) understood this as negating intrinsic knowledge, what room for objection does Khan Sahib or his intellectual descendants have?

The inquiry in the statements of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* is now complete. I have completed answering, with Allah's help, the four objections of Khan Sahib. I shall now commence the inquiry into *Husaam al-Haramayn* regarding the statements of *Hifz al-Imaan*.

The Slander against Hakim al-Ummah Hazrat Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh) : Degrading the Status of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and its Reply

With regards to Hakim al-Ummah Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Sahib Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh), Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib Barelwi wrote on pages 20-1 of *Husaam al-Haramayn*:

From the seniors of these Satanic Wahhabis is another man from the scions of Gangohi called Ashraf 'Ali al-Thanawi. He compiled a small treatise that does not reach four pages and stated clearly therein that the equivalent of the Messenger of Allah's (Allah bless him and grant him peace) knowledge of the unseen has been acquired by every child and every madman, rather every animal and every beast. These are his accursed words:

"If the assessment of the knowledge of unseen for the holy essence of the Nabi is valid as said by Zayd, it will be asked: What did he intend by this –

is it a portion of the unseen or all of it? If he intended a portion, then what speciality is there in this for the Revered Rasool, for indeed the equivalent of this knowledge of unseen has been acquired by Zayd and ‘Amr, rather every child and madman, rather all animals and beasts? And if he intended all whereby no part is excluded, its invalidity is established by narration and reason.”

I say: Look at the effects of the seal of Allah Almighty – how he equates [the knowledge of] the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) to [the knowledge of] such-and-such and such-and-such!

Here, I cannot give any answer to those ghastly and disgusting words which Khan Sahib has attributed to Hazrat Hakim al-Ummah. Its word-for-word retort can be given by those vulgar people who have also reached the status of “revivers” in the art of vulgarity and abuse. I am completely free of and helpless in this craft. The Wise Qur’an states: “Tell My servants that they should speak that which is best. Surely, Satan creates discord among them. Indeed, Satan is an open enemy to mankind.” (17:53) Elsewhere (in the Qur’aan) Allah Ta’ala addressed Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): “Repel evil with that which is best.” (23:96) Thus, according to this Qur’anic imperative, in reply to

this abuse and vulgarity of Khan Sahib, I will only offer [this plea] to Allah Azza Wa Jal: O My Rabb! Khan Sahib has passed on from this world. Now save his successors from this evil practice which is a shame and humiliation in this world and deprivation and loss in the afterlife.

Only Allah guides to the path of righteousness. It seems that when writing *Husaam al-Haramayn*, Khan Sahib took an oath that he will not be truthful and honest in any act. Ponder: What is the actual statement of *Hifz al-Imaan* and its true meaning, and what is the accursed calumny of Khan Sahib's slander, viz., – that the extent of the knowledge of the unseen which is possessed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is also possessed by every child and madman, nay every animal and every beast (Allah forbid!)? If before broadcasting his slander of disbelief, Khan Sahib had quoted the entire text of *Hifz al-Imaan* without mutilation, readers would have known the truth, then there would not have been the need for this refutation.

Hifz al-Imaan is a short treatise by Hakim al-Ummah (Rahmatullah alayh)[30] in which are three topics. The third topic is: "Is calling Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), 'knower of the *ghayb'*

[30] Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali al-Thanawi (d. 1943) was alive at the time of writing this piece and when it was first published in 1933 CE.

(Aalimul Ghaib) correct or not?" It is clear that the discussion of Mawlana was not regarding whether or not Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had knowledge of the *ghayb*, and if so, how much? Rather, here, Mawlana only wanted to establish that it cannot be said that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is "knower of the *ghayb*" (Aalimul Ghayb). There is a vast difference between the two issues.

An attribute which belongs to a being may not be utilized in an unrestricted manner for that being. In the Noble Qur'an, Allah is described as "the Creator of all things" (Qur'an 6:102, 13:16, 39:62, 40:62). It is the belief of all Muslims that everything in the world, small or big, great or insignificant, was created by Allah Ta'ala. However, despite this, our jurists have clearly stated that it is impermissible to call him "the Creator of monkeys and swine." Likewise, in the Noble Qur'an, "farming" is attributed to Him (Qur'an 56:64), yet it is incorrect to describe Him as a "farmer". Similarly, the Arabs use the term *rizq* (sustenance) in general for the provisions and positions which the commander endows to the men of his army. Thus in many books of Arabic language the sentence "the commander sustained the army" is written, although it is incorrect to refer to the commander as *raziq* or *razzaq* (sustainer). It is narrated by Hazrat

'A'ishah Siddiqah (Radhiyallahu anha) that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would mend his own shoes and milk his camels himself.

Despite this, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) may not be referred to as a cobbler or milkman. The reality is that in some instances despite the existence of an attribute in someone or some being, it may not be used in an unqualified manner for that person/being.

I hope that from this introduction my readers have understood that the question of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) possessing knowledge of *ghayb* or not is a separate discussion, apart from the issue of the permissibility or impermissibility of using the designation of *Aalimul Ghayb* ("The knower of the *ghayb*") for him. There is no necessary correlation between the two.

Now understand that the objective of Hazrat Mawlana (Rahmatullaah alayh) in *Hifz al-Imaan* was only to establish that it is impermissible to use the title of *Aalimul Ghaib* (Knower of the G*hayb)* in an unrestricted, all-embracing manner for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and to prove that this designation *(Aalimul Ghayb)* may not be used for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the way that the titles "the Seal of

the Ambiya," "the Chief of the Messengers," "the Mercy to all Worlds" etc. etc. are used. In support of this claim, Mawlana presented two proofs.

The upshot of the first evidence is that in the general usage of the Shari'ah, the title of *Aalimul Ghayb* (Knower of the G*hayb*) applies to only The Being who knows the matters of the *ghayb* intrinsically, without having acquired it via any medium. This is the exclusive distinction of Allah Azza Wa Jal. If any other being is called "knower of the *ghayb*," in this meaning, it will create the impression that the other being besides Allah Ta'ala also possesses knowledge of *ghayb* intrinsically, i.e. without having acquired it from any medium. This is s an explicit belief of *shirk*. Thus, to refer to anyone besides Allah Ta'ala as "Knower of the G*hayb*" is incorrect as it confuses it with a belief of *shirk*.

This is why in the Qur'an and Hadith such dubious words which could create misunderstanding are forbidden. For example, the Qur'an Shareef prohibits addressing Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the word, *ra'ina*[31] (2:104), and the

[31] In its original Arabic usage *ra'ina* means, "Observe us," but with a slightly different pronunciation it can be construed as an insult which some of the Jews exploited by "twisting their tongues" (Qur'an 4:46) to outwardly

Hadith prohibits calling one's servants "my slaves" because these words are suggestive of a false meaning even if it is not the intention of the speaker. This is a summary of Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi's first evidence.

However, since Khan Sahib did not object to this proof of Mawlana Thanawi – in fact, in many places of his book *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, Khan Sahib states approximately the same contention in complete detail, there is no need for me to present any justification or support for it.

Now, I will turn my attention to the second evidence of Mawlana. Khan Sahib claimed, "He stated clearly therein that the equivalent of the knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) regarding the unseen realities has been acquired by every child and every madman, in fact, by every animal."

But before quoting the original passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*, in order to facilitate the understanding of the readers, I feel it will be appropriate to mention that in this second proof, Mawlana divided the matter into two options for the opponent Then he proved the inaccuracy and falsity of both.

---

express the commonly understood meaning while intending insult and denigration. Consequently, the believers were forbidden from using it.

The upshot of the second proof of Mawlana is that a person, for example Zayd, uses the designation of *Aalimul Ghayb* (Knower of the G*hayb*) for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without qualifying the term. This entails one of two meanings. One: Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)) has partial knowledge of the *ghayb* or he has total and all-encompassing knowledge of the *ghayb*. The second meaning is obviously false because narrational (Naqli) and rational (Aqli) proofs negate all-encompassing, intrinsic *Ilm of the Ghayb* for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In fact, even Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself concedes this.

The first meaning, i.e. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *Aalimul Ghayb* because he is aware of some *ghayb*, is also erroneous and baseless. It is obvious that in this scenario it would entail that every person, rather even animals, can be called "knower of the *ghayb*" because some matters of the *ghayb* are possessed by all. Every animate being necessarily has some knowledge which is hidden from others. On this basis it follows that everyone may be called "knower of the *ghayb*", but this is rationally, scripturally and customarily, that is, in every way, erroneous. This is a summary of Mawlana's entire argument. Now, I will present the

original passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* with clarification [in parenthesis].

The Passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* and its Clarification

After explaining the first scenario, Mawlana writes:

If according to Zayd, it is valid to predicate the knowledge of *ghayb* to Rasulullah - Sallallahu alayhi wasallam - (i.e. meaning, calling Rasulullah - Sallallahu alayhi wasallam - the "Knower of the G*hayb*" in the all-encompassing meaning), then he (i.e. this Zayd) will be asked: "Does this refer to some *ghayb* or total *ghayb*?"

Here, Hazrat Mawlana asked this person (i.e. Zayd) who called Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the "Knower of the G*hayb*" : "On what basis do you refer to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as "knower of the *ghayb*"? Is it because Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has some knowledge of *ghayb*? Or is it because he has total knowledge of *ghayb*?)

If some knowledge of *ghayb* is intended (meaning, because of some knowledge of *ghayb*, you called Rasulullah= Sallallahu alayhi wasallam - the "Knower of the *Ghayb*", and your principle is that whoever has some knowledge of *ghayb* you refer to

him as "Knower of the G*hayb*"), then what distinction is there in this (meaning of knowledge of merely some *ghayb* for Rasulullah -Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Such (partial) knowledge of the *ghayb* (because of which you believe it is necessary to call someone "knower of the *ghayb*,") is available to Zayd and 'Amr, rather every child and madman, rather even all animals and quadrupeds because every person has knowledge of some matter which is hidden from a second person. Thus, everyone should be called "knower of the *ghayb*" (based on your principle that because of mere knowledge of some *ghayb*, a person may be called "knower of the *ghayb*").

An Explanation of the Distortion of Khan Sahib Barelwi of the Passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*

This was the original passage of Hazrat Mawlana, and this was its clear and explicit intent which I have presented. However, Khan Sahib, in his commentary, gave it such a meaning that even Satan after listening to it will seek refuge. In this respect, a brief description of Khan Sahib's distortion is as follows:

1. The word *aysa* (such/like this) appears in the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*, and its intent is some knowledge of *ghayb* in a specific. It does not refer

to the blessed knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). However, Khan Sahib claimed that the intention is the blessed knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hence he wrote: "He stated clearly therein that the equivalent of the Messenger of Allah's knowledge of the unseen has been acquired by every child and every madman, rather every animal and every beast."

1. The original passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* was as follows: "Such knowledge of the *ghayb* is available to Zayd and 'Amr, rather every child and madman, rather even all animals and quadrupeds; <u>because every person has knowledge of certain issues which are hidden from others.</u>." Khan Sahib totally omitted this underlined sentence in the middle of his quote because it is clearly understood from it that the knowledge that is conceded for Zayd, 'Amr etc. is some knowledge of *ghayb* in a specific sense, not (Allah forbid!) the blessed knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

2. After the abovementioned passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*, the conclusion of the *ilzami* argument[32] is worded as: "then all should be called 'knower of the *ghayb*'." Khan Sahib also omitted this, because

---

[32] Meaning, an argument in the form of presenting an absurdity as the necessary consequence of an opponent's claim in order to refute the claim itself.

from this sentence it is completely clear that the discussion of the author of *Hifz al-Iman* was not about the extent of the knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rather, his discussion was only about the unqualified usage of the title of "knower of the *ghayb*." After having realised this, the reality of the entire scheme of Khan Sahib is laid bare.

Anyhow, in order to declare the author of *Hifz al-Imaan* a disbeliever, Khan Sahib committed this deception, and those sentences from which the meaning of the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* can easily be understood were completely omitted in the middle, and he only quoted the first and last part of the passage. Shrewdly, in the Arabic translation of the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* which he presented to the Ulama of the two Harams, he gave no indication from which those revered Ulama could have understood that in the middle of this passage some sentences were missing. Our readers can see this handiwork in the Arabic passage of Khan Sahib's *Husaam al-Haramayn*, which I quoted from at the beginning of this discussion with its exact wording.

More Explanation of the Passage from *Hifz al-Iman*

Although the dishonesty of Khan Sahib and the condition of his fatwa will be understood by the readers from this explanation, to explain further, I wish to shed more light on its particular parts.

The upshot of the second evidence of Hazrat Hakim al-Ummah was this:

There are two scenarios in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) can be called "Knower of the G*hayb*." One is that, because of full *ghayb*, he is called "Knower of the *Ghayb*." The second is that, because of some *ghayb*, [he is called so]. The first option is false because the absence of his knowledge of all *ghayb* is established by narrational and rational proofs. And the second option is false because some knowledge of *ghayb* is possessed even by insignificant things in this world. Based on this principle, everyone should be called "knower of the *ghayb*", but this is baseless in every way.

If the parts of this proof are broken down, it will be realised that its basic premises are as follows:

1. So long as a principle does not subsist in a certain being, its morphological derivative [for example, the active participle] cannot be unqualifiedly used for it. For example, a person can be called "knower" when the attribute of knowledge is found in him; a person is called "ascetic" in whom

the attribute of asceticism subsists; and a person is called “writer” who has achieved the ability of writing; and other such examples.

1. With the cause, its effect must be found. It is not possible that the cause has no effect.

2. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not acquire knowledge of all *ghayb*.

3. Generally some awareness of the unseen is available to even those who are not Ambiya, and even to non-humans.

4. Every Zayd and ‘Amr cannot be called “knower of the *ghayb*.”

5. The falsity of the consequence (*lazim*) necessitates the falsity of that which it is consequential upon (*malzum*), meaning, if the acceptance of something necessarily leads to an absurdity, it is itself absurd.

From these premises, the first two and the last two are rationally accepted principles, and obvious. No sane person in the world will dispute this. I shall establish the third and fourth premises from the clear statements of Khan Sahib.

The accuser is a thousand times weightier than your witness

Proof of the most Important Premises of *Hifz al-Imaan* from the Statements of Khan Sahib himself

The third premise of Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi was that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not acquire full knowledge of the *ghayb*. Now note its proofs from the statements of the Barelwi learned man:

Khan Sahib wrote on page 25 of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*:

For indeed we do not claim that he (Allah bless him and grant him peace) had encompassed all the things known to Allah (Glorified and Exalted is He), for indeed it is impossible for creation.

And in the same *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, he writes:

And we do not affirm through the bestowal of Allah Almighty also but a part. (*al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, p 28)

And this Khan Sahib writes on page 34 of *Tamhid e Iman*:

Even the knowledge of the Nabi (Allah bless him and grant him peace) does not encompass all things known to the Divine Being.

Furthermore, on page 34 of this *Tamhid* is written:

And encompassing knowledge of all things known to the Divine Being is also false and against most scholars. *(i.e. if attributed to others besides Allah Ta'ala).*

The import, nay the objective, of all these passages of Khan Sahib is that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not acquire knowledge of all *ghayb*. The acquisition of detailed knowledge of all the unseen is impossible for him, nay for all creatures, and believing in this is false. This is precisely the third premise in Mawlana Thanawi's evidence. With praise to Allah, from the explicit statements of Khan Sahib, this has become clear as daylight. So all praise is due to Allah.

The fourth premise of the evidence of Mawlana Thanawi under inspection was that generally awareness of some unseen matters is acquired by non-Ambiya and even non-humans too.

Take note of its proof from the statements of Khan Sahib Barelwi also:

The aforementioned learned man wrote on page 13 of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*:

Indeed we believe in the Resurrection, and in the Garden and the Fire, and in Allah Almighty and the

seven fundamentals of His (Exalted and Majestic is He) attributes, and all of this is *ghayb*. And we know each in its own right, distinguished from other than it, so this necessitates the acquisition of general detailed knowledge of the unseen for every believer.

Moreover, this Khan Sahib says on page 24 of *Khalis al-I'tiqad*:

Allah Almighty said about the Muslims, "they believe in the unseen" (Qur'an 2:3). Belief is consent, and consent is knowledge. The thing which is fundamentally unknowable, how is its belief possible? Indeed [it says] in *al-Tafsir al-Kabir*: "There is no obstacle in saying, 'We know of the *ghayb* that for which we have evidence.'"

It is known from these two passages of Khan Sahib that some knowledge of the *ghayb* is necessary for every believer.

Khan Sahib said regarding a prophecy of his father:

This was a prophecy made forty years ago. Allah Almighty grants His accepted slaves knowledge of *ghayb* because they are the bearers of the shoes of the slaves of the slaves of the Holy Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace). (*Malfuzat A'la Hazrat*)

In proving that in itself, *kashf* (inspiration) is nothing of perfection. It may occur to even non-Muslims, nay to even non-humans. Khan Sahib quoted from one of his elders whom he explicitly called a "friend of Allah", the story of a strange and wonderful donkey who had the ability of *kashf*:

I was going to Egypt. There was a huge gathering. I saw a man with a donkey whose eyes were tied with a stone. One person's belongings would be placed in the possession of another person. Then the donkey would be asked about its location, and the donkey would circle the entire gathering, until it reached the person who had it, and in front of him he would bow. (*Malfuzat*, Part 4, p. 11)

After this, Khan Sahib said:

Thus, it is understood that the attribute which is possible for a non-human, it is not a perfection for a human being. (Part 4, p. 11)

It is known from this statement of Khan Sahib that according to him, this donkey also knew some hidden things. And this is the objective.

I have quoted one passage from Khan Sahib's *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah* in which is clearly stated that Allah Ta'ala, His attributes, the Garden and the Fire,

the Angels etc. etc. are all matters of the *ghayb*, and this is completely correct.

Based on this, even though Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself is not *ghayb*, his Risaalat is undoubtedly a matter of the *ghayb*, because it is not a tangible and physical entity. There is a hidden relationship between Allah and the Rasool which is beyond the comprehension of our intellectual faculties. Based only on the integrity of the Rasool, is he accepted as the Messenger of Allah. Thus, whoever acquires knowledge of the existence of Allah Ta'ala, His Oneness or of the Risaalat of the Rasool, he has acquired some knowledge of the unseen. Khan Sahib concedes that everything in existence, even the leaves of trees and sands of the desert, are accountable for believing in Tawhid and Risaalat. They glorify Allah Azza Wa Jal and they testify to the Nubuwwat and Risaalat of the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

For example, on Part 4, page 77, of Khan Sahib's *Malfuzat*, he writes:

Everything is accountable for believing in Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and for glorifying Allah Ta'ala.

Moreover, on page 78 of it is written:

A particular spirituality is connected to every plant and every inanimate object, whether that is called a "soul" or something else, and that thing is accountable for faith and glorification. It says in a hadith: "There is nothing but it knows that "I am the Messenger of Allah, except the rebellious of the jinn and man."

The following matters are established from these statements of Khan Sahib:

1. Every believer must know some matters of the *ghayb*

1. Even non-Muslims experience *kashf*

2. Even a stupid animal like a donkey has knowledge of some hidden matters

3. All things in existence, even plants and inanimate objects, know some things of *ghayb*

And this was the fourth premise in the proof of Mawlana Thanawi.

The result is that those premises on which Mawlana's proof were based, four are accepted principles of reason and are conspicuously apparent, and two were dependent on proofs, which I have, with praise to Allah, proven from the clear expressions of Khan Sahib. Thus, our readers will

understand that the entire basis on which Khan Sahib applied the ruling of *kufr* on Hazrat Mawlana is also shared and accepted by Khan Sahib, and if it necessitated *kufr*, then Khan Sahib has an equal share in that *kufr*.

Although there is no need to present anything else regarding the statement of *Hifz al-Imaan*, but for further clarification, I shall present an illustration.

An Illustration of the Statement from *Hifz al-Imaan*

Assume that some disciple or devotee of Khan Sahib refers to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the "Knower of the G*hayb*" and believes it to be permissible. To him I ask: "Do you refer to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the 'Knower of the *Ghayb'* because of all-encompassing *ghayb* or partial *ghayb*? If encompassing *ghayb*, then that is, according to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, absurd rationally, and false scripturally, rather, impossible. On the other hand, if you refer to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the 'Knower of the *Ghayb*' because of some *ghayb*, and it is your principle that whoever has knowledge of some *ghayb*, you will call him the 'Knower of the G*hayb*,' then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will have no distinction

in this because some matters of *ghayb* are possessed by every believer, infact, by all of humanity, all things, even animals and inanimate objects. Therefore, based on your principle it is necessary that you call everything in the world 'knower of the *ghayb*.' Now, if you say that you call everything 'knower of the *ghayb*,' then what superiority and excellence have been conferred upon Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by also calling him 'knower of the *ghayb*' ? According to your logic and view everyone *(and everything)* is a 'knower of the *ghayb*'?"

Respected readers, note: Will any sane person understand from my argument that I have, Allah forbid!, equated the knowledge of other beings and creatures to the knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

Take note of another more general illustration:

The king of a country is extremely generous. He operates a public kitchen, and he feeds thousands of needy and poor people in the morning and evening. Now, some idiot, for example Zayd, calls that king *raziq* (sustainer). A second person, 'Amr, asks him: "Brother, why do you refer to the king as *raziq*? Is it because he gives sustenance to all creation? Or is it because he feeds some people?

The first is obviously false, so only the second option remains, which is that the king is called *raziq* because he feeds some people. However, giving him the title in this second meaning there is, no distinction for him because even a poor man and a menial labourer fill the bellies of their children. Besides humans, even small birds feed their chicks, so according to your principle, everyone and every creature may be called *raziq*."

It should be asked, did 'Amr mean by this statement that the generous and beneficent king and every poor and menial labourer are equal in their generosity? It is obvious that this understanding is a manifestation of the idiocy of the one who understood it. Thus, whatever was said in *Hifz al-Imaan* is nothing more than this.

I shall now cite a statement from *Sharh al-Mawaqif* of the accepted Scholar of Ahl al-Sunna, Imam 'Allamah Sayyid Sharif (rahmatullah alayh), which is identical to the statement of *Hifz al-Imaan*, so that after reading this no Sunni Muslim will dare to open his mouth against *Hifz al-Imaan*, because whatever is in *Hifz al-Imaan*, is approximately a translation of this passage from *Sharh al-Mawaqif*. The 'Allamah wrote [underlined is the original text of al-Iji and the remainder is from the commentary, *Sharh al-Mawaqif*]:

<u>As for the philosophers, they say: He</u> i.e. the Nabi **<u>is the one in whom three special features combine</u>**, by which he is distinguished from others. **<u>The first of them</u>**, i.e. the first of the matters that are exclusive to him, **<u>is that he is cognizant of the *ghayb*</u>**, the present, the past and the future.

After this, in a few lines, he proves on behalf of the philosophers that this matter is not farfetched for the Ambiya (upon them peace). Then he says on behalf of the philosophers:

<u>And why</u> would this cognizance [of the *ghayb*] in respect to the Nabi be considered farfetched, **<u>when</u>** that is **<u>found in those you say his preoccupations are exercise</u>** with [various] types of [spiritual] struggles, **<u>or illness</u>**, averting the soul from preoccupation with the body and using sensory organs, **<u>or sleep</u>**, disconnecting thereby his external senses; since these [individuals] are cognizant of the *ghayb* and give information about it as attested to by transmission and experience whereby no doubt about it remains for those who are just?

This was a description of the position of the philosophers and their proofs. After this, the author (Allah have mercy on him) gives an answer on behalf of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama‘ah, and says:

<u>We say</u>: What you mentioned is **<u>rejected</u>** for [various] reasons: **<u>because cognizance of all *ghayb* is not necessary for the Nabi by agreement</u>** between us and you, and for this [reason] the Chief of the Prophets said, "Had I knowledge of the *ghayb*, I should have abundance of wealth, and adversity would not touch me" (Qur'an 7:188); **<u>and a part</u>**, i.e. cognizance of part [of the *ghayb*], **<u>is not specific to him</u>**, i.e. to the prophet, **<u>as you have agreed</u>**, since you allowed it for the exercisers, the ill and the sleepers, so the Nabi is not distinguished thereby from others.

Fair readers should take note, what is the difference between this passage of *Sharh al-Mawaqif* and the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* under inquiry?

I hope that after this explanation of the passage from *Hifz al-Imaan*, no doubt of the opponents remains. To complete the proof for this, I will briefly quote the answer which Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi wrote in his reply to this slander.

When this fatwa, *Husaam al-Haramayn*, of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib was published, and it caused a great stir, the respected Mawlana Sayyid Murtaza Hasan Sahib wrote a letter to Mawlana Thanawi:

“Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib Barelwi wrote with respect to you that you (Allah forbid!) stated explicitly in *Hifz al-Imaan* that the equivalent of the knowledge the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) possesses from the matters of the *ghayb* is possessed by every child and every madman and every animal. Did you write this anywhere in *Hifz al-Imaan*, and is this your belief? And if this is not your belief, what is your position towards someone who holds this revolting belief?” (Summarised from *Bast al-Banaan*)

Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi gave the answer:

“I did not write this disgusting content in any book. Let alone writing it, this thought never crossed my heart. Nor is it the necessary conclusion of any speech of mine, as I will explain later. Since I understand this content to be revolting,how can it be my intent? The person who believes this, or without belief utters it explicitly or implicitly, I believe him to be outside the fold of Islam because he has denied decisive texts and denigrated Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).”

Thereafter, in that book, *Bast al-Banaan*, Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi gave a detailed reply to this accusation of Khan Sahib and explained the meaning of the passage from *Hifz al-Imaan* under

discussion. However, now there is no need to quote it because all that I wrote to explain this passage above is in effect an elaboration of this answer of Hazrat Mawlana.

Respected readers carefully note how far the Barelwi learned man was from truth and integrity in this fatwa.

And Allah is the One Who guides to the path of rightness.

Addendum:
The Author of *Hifz al-Imaan's* Search for Truth and his laudable Declaration of Rewording the Passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*

Respected readers! The debate-style reply to the fatwa of disbelief which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib issued in *Husaam al-Haramayn* by attributing a heretical content to *Hifz al-Imaan* has terminated, and the readers will understand that its reality is nothing besides slander and fabrication, and the author of *Hifz al-Imaan* is completely innocent of this impure and heretical belief ascribed falsely to him.

A sincere person drew the attention of Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Sahib Thanawi (Rahmatullah

alayh) by suggesting that: "although the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* in reality is completely sound and free of doubt, if the words with which the ungodly and obstinate people deceive the fickle simple-minded commoners were rephrased, these commoners who are susceptible to *fitnah* would not succumb to the deception, so for the sake of the fickle lay-people this would be best."

Hazrat Thanawi made dua for the one who gave him this advice and wholeheartedly accepted the advice and changed the passage in the following way:

In the old passage, the sentence which began as "such knowledge of the *ghayb*" was substituted for the sentence: "mere knowledge of some unseen matters has been attained by non-Ambiya." This incident occurred in Safar of 1342 H (September 1923 CE). Thus, approximately 32 years ago this revision had taken place in the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*. After this, *Hifz al-Imaan* has continued to be printed with this revision. Rather, the entire circumstance behind this revision and its announcement on behalf of the revered author (Allah have mercy on him) was printed as an addendum to *Hifz al-Imaan* called *Taghyir al-'Unwaan*.

Thereafter, in Jumada al-Ukhra of 1354 H, it happened that because of the advice of a certain individual, the worthless writer of these lines (Muhammad Manzur Nu‘mani) himself proposed in the presence of Hazrat Hakim al-Ummah (Allah have mercy on him), that the intent of the words "apply the ruling of the knowledge of *ghayb*" at the very beginning of the passage from *Hifz al-Iman* which the obstinate ones object to, is, without doubt, the unqualified usage of "knower of the *ghayb*," which is obvious from the preceding and succeeding parts of this passage, and in *Bast al-Banaan* and *Taghyir al-‘Unwaan*, Hazrat stated explicitly this. Therefore, if in the original passage "ruling" is changed to "unqualified usage" the matter will become even more clear and will leave no room for doubt. Hazrat, without any hesitation, accepted this and changed the sentence as follows: "Furthermore, if unqualifiedly using 'knower of the *ghayb*' for the holy essence is sound according to the statement of Zayd..." And he instructed this worthless one to announce this revision on his behalf. Thus, in Rajab of 1354 H, in [the journal] *al-Furqaan*, this announcement was made.

Anyhow, after those two revisions, the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* reads as follows:

"Furthermore, if unqualifiedly using "knower of the *ghayb*" for the holy essence is sound according to the statement of Zayd, he will be asked about this matter, that, is the intent of this *ghayb* some *ghayb* or all *ghayb*? If some unseen sciences is intended, what distinction is there for the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in this? Mere knowledge of some unseen matters has been attained by non-Ambiya, so everyone should be called "knower of the *ghayb*."

The result is that our elders declared their innocence and abhorrence for the heretical beliefs which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib attributed to them, and audaciously declaring them disbelievers. In addition, our elders explained the true and real meaning of those passages. They further proved that there is nothing in their statements that is against the teachings and beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

In order to protect fickle simple-minded laymen from misunderstanding, if any person sincerely advised them to rephrase their statements, then without deliberation and without any ill feeling, they accepted the advice. No doubt this is clear evidence of their sincere quest of the truth and their selflessness. How unfortunate! How unjust and

wretched are those people who call these noble slaves of Allah disbelievers!

Muhammad Manzur Nu'mani (Allah pardon him)
21, Dhu al-Hijjah, 1373 Hijri

Appendix A: Summary of Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi's Exegesis of the Phrase "Seal of the Ambiya" in *Tahzir al-Naas*

Tahzirun Naas is a treatise in the form of a legal response (fatwa) from Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi to a question posed regarding the narration of 'Abdullah Ibn 'Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) confirming the existence of Ambiya like the Ambiya on this earth, on six other 'earths' (planets). Is this narration authentic? How does acceptance of the narration impact on Rasulullah's (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) status as the last and final Nabi? (*Tahzir al-Naas min Inkaar Athar ibn 'Abbas*, Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi, Idarat al-'Aziz Publishers, 2001, p. 40)

He begins with a lengthy explanation of the term "Seal of the Ambiya" mentioned in the Qur'aan, which he states if fully understood, will assist in answering the question. Then he presents an exegetical dilemma on the interpretation of this phrase in the context of the Qur'aanic verse. In the understanding of the common people, this simply means the last of a series of Ambiya.
However, appearing before or after in the chronological sense, does not of itself confer

excellence, for example, Nabi Ibrahim (Alayhis salaam) is superior to many Ambiya who came after him. (ibid. p. 41) The term "Seal of the Ambiya" must be a term of merit and praise for two reasons: First, those things which are not of relevance in relation to his Nubuwwat, e.g. physical form, colour, lineage, etc. are not given as titles to him in the Qur'aan, so its mention without merit would be imagined as an "excess" in His (Allah's) Speech, as there would be no difference whether it is mentioned or not.

Second, with respect to the people of perfection, like Ambiya and Auliya, titles used for them are for the purpose of lauding them with praise and merit, as is clear from historical writings. Thus the assumption that such titles are without any intent of praise may lead to denigration of the greatness of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). (ibid. p. 42)

An objection to this reasoning is that the term "Seal of the Ambiya" in this meaning (i.e. without intent of praise) is not devoid of purpose and benefit, as Islam, being the final religion, must negate the legitimacy of any false future claimants to Nubuwwat who will be the cause of the misguidance of many. Hence, with this meaning of "the Seal of

the Ambiya," this door of misguidance is closed. (ibid. p. 42)

The (term of) Conjunction (*istidraak*) in the Qur'an 33:40 implies that the term "Seal of the Ambiya" affirms Spiritual Fatherhood (as well)

Mawlana Nanotwi explains that, even then, (i.e. if the only meaning of the term) "Seal of the Ambiya" is "last Nabi chronologically speaking" then this meaning is not free of difficulties. This is because the verse reads: "Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Ambiya." (33:40). The word "but" (*laakin*) is a conjunction (*'atf*) used for *istidraak* (rectification), that is, to correct (or eliminate) a doubt (*shubh*) or false assumption that may have been created from the previous sentence. Hence, the sentence that he is "the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Ambiya," corrects a possible misconception that may arise from the sentence, "Muhammad is not the father of any of your men." (ibid. p. 42)

While the verse clearly negates biological and physical (*jismani*) fatherhood, the doubt may arise that he does not deserve the respect a father deserves, or that he does not hold the position of a spiritual (*ma'nawi*) father to anyone. This erroneous assumption is corrected by the sentence, "but the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of Ambiya." Thus, by this latter sentence, the doubt that he is not the

“father” in any sense of the word is eliminated. Spiritual fatherhood of this Ummah is implicit in the phrase “the Messenger of Allah,” and that he is the spiritual fatherhood of all previous Ambiya, and by implication of their peoples, is established by the phrase “the Seal of the Ambiya.” (ibid. p. 57)

The term “Messenger” implies he is the spiritual father of the Ummah. Mawlana Nanotwi explains this at length in conjunction with the verse of the Qur’an which states, “The Rasool is closer to the believers than themselves.” (33:6) Because our belief is a consequence of his revelation from Allah. Mawlana Nanotwi writes extensively on this point based on linguistic, theological and philological analyses. (ibid. pp. 58-64)

Essential Sealship and its Proofs

In his elaboration, Mawlana Nanotwi explains that the status of the Nubuwwat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is absolutely independent in that it was not an acquisition from any other Nabi, but was a direct bestowal to him by Allah Ta’ala, while the Nubuwwat of all others is derived from his Nubuwwat. Therefore, their Nubuwwat and all the excellences of their respective Nubuwwat terminated upon his Nubuwwat. Thus, even in this sense he is the “Seal of the Ambiya.” (ibid. p. 43)

Mawlana Nanotwi elaborately substantiates this in three ways:

First, verse 3:81 of the Qur’aan: “[Remember]

when We took the covenant of the Ambiya: Indeed, that which I have given to you of the Book and Wisdom, then (when) a Messenger [i.e. Muhammad – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam] confirming what is with you comes to you, believe in him and aid him." This verse proves that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the "Nabi of the Ambiya" (*Nabi al-Anbiya*), hence all the Ambiya are commanded to believe in him and to aid him if he were to appear in their time. Thus, Mawlana Nanotwi concludes that their Nubuwwat is subject to his absolute Nubuwwat. This is also indicated by the hadith which states: "If Musa (Alayhis salaam) was living, he would have had no option but to follow me." This is also indicated by the fact that when Nabi 'Isa (Alaihis salaam) returns to earth, he will be a follower of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In this way, the Nubuwwat of all other Ambiya ends at the Nubuwwat of the Seal of the Ambiya (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His Nubuwwat is not an effusion (*faydh*) of or an acquisition by the medium (*bi wasitah*) of any other Nubuwwat. On the other hand, the Nubuwwat of all the other Ambiya is an effusion of his Nubuwwat. Hence, all the excellences of the Ambiya are accumulated in his Nubuwwat and Seal. The hadith, "I was the Seal of the Ambiya by Allah while Aadam was an admixture of clay," can be understood in this way, that his Nubuwwat was the initial springboard of Nubuwwat from which the other Ambiya acquired their Nubuwwat. (ibid. p. 44)

Second, there are two types of excellences: knowledge and deeds. Four categories of people are praised in the Qur'an: The Ambiya, the Auliya (*siddiqeen*), the Shuhada (martyrs) and the Saliheen (the pious). (4:69). The first two have excellences in knowledge and the second two in deeds. The Ambiya are the sources of perfection in knowledge and the Auliya are the repositories for this. The Shuhada are the source of perfection in deeds and the pious are the repositories for this. The word *nabi* is derived from *naba'a* which means to inform, and *siddeeq* is derived from *saddaqa* which means to assent, so the Ambiya are the fountainheads of knowledge and the Auliya are its repositories i.e. those who assent to that knowledge. This is also corroborated by the hadith, "Whatever Allah infused into my breast, I infused into the breast of Abu Bakr," who is known as "the greatest *Siddeeq*."

Here, Mawlana Nanotwi also makes the point that because Nubuwwat is perfection in knowledge and not deeds, apparently (*bi-zaahir*) a follower's deeds may become equal to or exceed the deeds of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). (ibid. pp. 44-48) The reason he mentions "apparently" or "outwardly" is because this is in terms of the "quantity" and not the quality of deeds. His knowledge is both quantitatively and qualitatively superior. Although this statement was misused by the detractors of Mawlana Nanotwi to malign him, the very same point was articulated by Imam al-Razi under verse 2:34 of the Qur'an, in which he

says, "We do indeed find in the Ummah those who have a longer life and strive more rigorously than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)." This statement of fact, that sometimes outwardly a follower performs more good deeds than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was used by al-Razi as a premise in his argument just as it was by Mawlana Nanotwi.

Mawlana Nanotwi also explains in some detail how martyrdom and piety are perfections in deeds and not knowledge. (pp. 48-49)

The knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was complete and perfect, while the knowledge of the other Ambiya was not as complete and perfect as his. Hence, he said, "I was taught (*'ullimtu*)," or "I was given (*utitu*) the knowledge of the first and the last," i.e. my knowledge encompasses the spiritual knowledge of all peoples. This is because he is the true knower (*'alim haqiqi*) while the knowledge of all other knowers is derived from him. In the same way our knowledge from our sensual faculties combine in our rational soul (*nafs natiqah*). The senses do not themselves "perceive," knowledge of the divine and transcendental realities which combine in Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and originate in him, while for everyone else before and after him, it is derived from him. Verse 3:81 of the Qur'an describes Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as"confirming all that which is with you [i.e. the Ambiya],". Here the word *ma* (that) is general

(*'aam*), hence it includes all the knowledge in the Scriptures of the Ambiya who were sent previously. Hence, his absolute knowledge – absolute in the sense that it is not derived from any other person, but was bestowed to him directly by Allah. Absolute knowledge is a necessary corollary of his absolute Nubuwwat since Nubuwwat is perfection in knowledge.

Another proof which Mawlana Nanotwi presents for this perfection in knowledge is his greatest miracle, the Qur'aan, which is a Book of knowledge and "an explanation of all things" (Qur'an 16:89). (ibid. pp. 44-50)

Third, the hadith, "I was a Nabi while Aadam was between body and spirit" proves that his Nubuwwat was established at a time before the creation of Aadam (Alayhis salaam), and that his Nubuwwat supersedes the Nubuwwat of all the Ambiya. (ibid. p. 50)

On the basis of these evidences Mawlana Nanotwi concludes that the Nubuwwat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is absolute, i.e. it is not derived from any other Nabi, while that of other Ambiya is of a secondary nature having been derived from his Nubuwwat. In this manner the term, "the Seal of the Ambiya stated in the Verse" implies that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the spiritual father of the Ambiya. This meaning is the logical extrapolation of the conjunctive term *laakin* (*istidraak*) in the verse.

Chronological Seal of the Ambiya (K*hatm Nubuwwat Zamani*) is a Necessary Consequence of the Intrinsic Seal (*Khatm Nubuwwat Zaati*)

Mawlana Nanotwi explains that the Intrinsic Seal as described above also necessarily implies that he is the last of all the Ambiya chronologically. This is because a hypothetical new nabi will either bring a new shariat, or he will not. In both cases, the Intrinsic Seal of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prevents this from happening.

In the assumption, if the hypothetical nabi who was commissioned after the Seal of the Ambiya came with a different law, this would mean a nabi of lower status abrogated the law of a Nabi of superior status, and this is contrary to the rule established in verse 2:106 of the Qur'aan which states: "We do not abrogate any revelation, or cause it to be forgotten, except we bring better than it or the like of it." (ibid. p. 52)

And if he were to bring the same law, this nubuwwat would hold no meaning as Nubuwwat is a perfection in knowledge and all knowledge has culminated in Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and his perfect knowledge in the Book that is an "explanation of all things" will forever be preserved (Qur'an 15:9) as opposed to the Ambiya of lesser status – the Ambiya of Bani Israaeel. The knowledge given to them was corrupted by their

followers. Therefore, no new nabi can appear after the Seal of the Ambiya, with or without a new law. Hence, chronological finality (*ta'akkhur zamaani*) is a necessary consequence of Absolute finality. (ibid. pp. 52-53)

The Multiple Meanings of Finality

Coming first or last (*taqaddum/ta'akhkhur*) is a generic *(jinsi)* attribute which manifests in three different ways: chronological (*zamaani*), spatial (*makaani*) and positional (*rutbi*). Seal (*khaatam*) implies finality. It also bears these three possible meanings. If however only one of the three meanings is meant in the statement "Seal of the Ambiya", i.e. it is either *khaatam zamaan al-nabiyyin* (seal as applicable to the chronological order of the Ambiya), or *khaatam rutbat al-nabiyyin* (seal pertaining to the status of the Ambiya) or *khaatam makaan al-nabiyyin* (seal of the place of the Ambiya). However, in such generic words, if all meanings can be adopted, then that is the preferred option. Hence, the preferred view according to Mawlana Nanotwi is that the evident indication (*dalala mutabiqi*) of the term "the Seal of the Ambiya" is finality in terms of time, place and position. (ibid.p. 53-55)

This is akin to the verse, "Wine, gambling, altars and divining arrows, are only filth (*rijs*)," (5:90) where "filth" is a general (*'aam*) word including physical and spiritual filth since wine is a physical/material filth and the others are spiritual filth. In the same way "filth" is inclusive of a

number of sub-categories with differing qualities included under its general meaning, "Seal" is inclusive of a number of sub-categories under its general meaning. Finality in merit was explained as Absolute Sealship. Chronological finality means his era came after all the Ambiya. And, spatial finality entails Nubuwwat manifesting on the highest of all earths, which is explained in Ahaadith which reveal that the earth we inhabit is the uppermost of all earths. The other six earths also have Ambiya as confirmed in the narration of Ibn 'Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) in the question.

Conclusion

The benefit of this interpretation, Mawlana Nanotwi insists, is that it eliminates the ambiguity (istidraak) present in the verse. It explains what Seal means in the best possible way, while not compromising on the chronological finality of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He writes: "Now you can see that if this view is accepted, the conjunction between the two sentences, will become clear, and the meaning of the Seal is established in the best possible way. At the same time Chronological Seal is also not lost." (ibid. p. 57)

Appendix B:

Al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi's Explanation of the Designation, "Seal of the Ambiya" in *Kitaab Khaatm al-Awliya'*

Abu 'Abdullah Muhammad ibn 'Ali ibn al-Hasan al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi (230 – 320 H), a great Scholar of

Hadith and Usul, author of the well-known work *Nawaadir al-Usul*, and from the great masters of Tasawwuf, wrote in his work *Kitaab Khaatm al-Awliya'*:
A speaker said to him [al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi]: What is the Seal of Nubuwwat?

He replied: The Proof of Allah over His creation, in realisation of His (Exalted is He) statement: "and give good news to those who believe that they have a 'Pedestal of Truth' with their Rabb." (10:2)

So Allah certified for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) true servitude. Thus when the Judge appears in His majesty and greatness, on that plane, and He says: "O My bondsmen! I created you only for My obeisance (i.e. to worship Me)! Therefore, worship Me (in total submission)!" There will be no sense or movement left for anyone due to the awe and grandeur of that position, except Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). For by that Pedestal of truth that he has, he proceeds ahead of all the ranks of Ambiya and Rusul (Messengers) because he was (enabled to offer) the highest stage of obeisance to Allah Azza Wa Jal. So Allah will accept it [i.e. obeisance] from him and elevate him to the Praised Platform (*al-maqam al-mahmud*) near the *Divine Kursi*. Thereupon, the veil over that Seal will be removed, and *Noor* will encompass him. The rays of that Seal will shine over him. From his heart to his tongue will spring such praise which none from His creation had

hitherto heard. Thus, all the Ambiya will know that Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was the most knowledgeable of them regarding Allah Azza Wa Jal. He will be the first converser and the first intercessor, so he will be given the Standard of Praise and Keys of Generosity. The Standard of Praise is for the bulk of the believers while the Keys of Generosity for the Ambiya. The Seal of Nubuwwat has a profound condition and station, more profound than you can bear, so I hope that this much is sufficient for you of its knowledge."

So Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) becomes the intercessor for the Ambiya, the Auliya and for others besides them. Do you not see his (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) speech regarding the station of the Praised Platform: "Even Ibrahim the *Khaleel* (Friend) of the Allah, The Merciful, will need me on that day"? That was narrated to me by Jarud from al-Nadr ibn Shumayl from Hisham al-Dastawa'i from Hammad who traced it to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Do you not see that Allah Azza Wa Jal mentioned good news to the believers in many verses but did not mention it except with a condition: "and give good news to those who believe and do righteous deeds" (2:25) and he mentioned it here without a condition [i.e. without the condition of "righteous works"]: "and give good news to those who believe that they have a Pedestal of Truth with their Rabb," informing them that the salvation of all on that day is through this Pedestal of Truth [i.e. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi

wasallam]?

As for the proof, it is as though He says to the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam): "O Assembly of Ambiya! This is Muhammad. He came at the end of time, weak in body, weak in might, weak in livelihood, short in life. He produced what you have seen of true obeisance and copious knowledge. And you in your speech, your lives and your bodies did not produce what he produced." Thereupon, the veil over the Seal will be removed, and all talk will end, and it will become a proof over all creation; because the object which is sealed is guarded. And thus is Allah's (Exalted is He) administration over us in this world: when a thing is found with its seal, doubt is removed and argumentation ends amongst people.

So Allah gathered the particles of Nubuwwat for Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and He perfected them and sealed them with His seal. So neither his self (*nafs*) nor his enemy can find a path to enter the place of his Nubuwwat due to that Seal. Do you not see the hadith of al-Hasan al-Basri (Rahmatullah alayh) from Anas ibn Malik (Radhiyallahu anhu)? In the hadith of intercession by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that he said: "When they come to Aadam they will ask him to intercede for them by their Rabb. Aadam will say to them: 'What is your opinion, if your goods were collected in your absence and then sealed [i.e. tied away], will the goods only be approached from the seal? So go to Muhammad for he is the Seal of the

Ambiya.'" Its meaning according to us is that Nubuwwat in its entirety has culminated in Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His heart was made a vessel for the perfection of Nubuwwat and then it was sealed.

Allah did not leave the proof concealed in the inside of his heart for He made it manifest. Between his shoulders that Seal was conspicuous like the egg of a pigeon. This is for him a great station the story of which is long.

Indeed the one who is blind to this information, he thinks that the interpretation of "the Seal of the Ambiya" is only that he is the last of them in being sent. But what virtue is there in this? And what perfection in knowledge is there in this? This is the interpretation of ignorant people.

Most recite *khaatam* (seal) with *fath* on the *ta'*. As for those from the Salaf who recited with *kasr* on the *ta'* [i.e. as *khaatim*], its interpretation is that he is a *khaatim* (sealer) in the sense of the active participle. That is, he sealed Nubuwwat by the Seal which he was given. Confirming this reality is what was narrated in the hadith of the Ascension (*Mi'raj*) from the hadith of Abu Ja'far al-Razi from al-Rabi' ibn Abi al-'Aliyah from what he mentioned regarding the meeting of the Ambiya in the Aqsa Musjid: "So every Nabi (Alayh Salaam) mentioned the favour of Allah upon him, and it was from the speech of Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that

he said: 'He made me the Sealer and the Opener.' So Ibrahim (Alayhis salaam) said: 'By this, Muhammad is superior to all of you.'"

(*Kitaab Khaatm al-Awliya'*, Edited by Othman I. Yahya, Imperial Catholique, Beirut, pp. 338-342)

Appendix C: Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri's Explanation of the Controversy on *Imkaanul Kizb*

In the treatise *al-Tasdiqaat li Daf' al-Talbisaat*, also known as *al-Muhannad 'ala al-Mufannad*, Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri answered three related questions on the issue of the possibility of a lie in Allah's speech (Exalted is He) and Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi's position on the matter. Since these answers shed further light on the matter, a translation of these answers is reproduced here.

Question Twenty Three:

Did the eminent *shaykh*, the scholar of his time, Mawlawi Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, say that the Creator (Exalted is He) has actually lied, and that the one who says this has not erred, or is this amongst the slanders against him? Assuming the latter, how do you respond to what al-Barelwi mentioned that he has with him a photocopy of the deceased *shaykh*'s fatwa stating this?

Answer:

That which they attributed to the eminent and incomparable shaykh, the scholar of his time, the peerless of his age, Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, that he said that the Creator (Exalted is His Eminence) actually lied and that the one who says this has not erred, is a slander against him (Rahmatullah alayh). It is from the lies concocted by the deceptive and lying devils (Allah confound them! How they are perverted!). He is innocent of such heresy and disbelief. The fatwa of the *shaykh* (Rahmatullah alayh) that was printed and published in volume one of his *Fatawa Rashidiyyah* (p. 119) falsifies their [claim]. It is in Arabic and was verified and stamped with the seals of the ‘ulama of Makkah al-Mukarramah. A copy of this question and answer follows:

In Allah’s Name, the Ever Merciful, the Beneficent. We praise Him and send blessing on His noble Messenger. What is your view on Allah being described with the attribute of falsehood? And what is the ruling on the one who believes He lies? Provide us with an answer, and be rewarded.
Answer:
Allah (Exalted is He) is certainly free from having the attribute of falsehood, and no element of falsehood is found in His Speech, as Allah says, “Who is more truthful than Allah in speech?” (4:122) Whoever believes or professes that Allah lies, he is certainly an accursed disbeliever, and has opposed the Kitaab, the Sunnah and the consensus of the Ummah.

Yes, the belief of the people of faith is that which Allah foretold in the Qur'an, that Pharaoh, Haaman and Abu Lahab are from the inhabitants of Hell, it is an absolute decision that He will not act contrary to, but Allah (Exalted is He) is able to admit them into Paradise and is not incapable of this, but He will not do so by His choice.

Allah Azza Wa Jal said, "And if We had so willed, We could have given every soul its guidance, but the word from Me concerning evil-doers took effect: that I will fill the Fire with jinn and mankind together." (Qur'aan 32:12) It is evident from this verse that had Allah wished, He would have made all people believers but He does not contradict what He says, and this is all by choice, not coercion. He is a Doer by choice, acting as He wills.

This is the belief of all the 'Ulama of this Ummah, as al-Baydawi said under the explanation of His statement (Exalted is He), "If you forgive them…" (Qur'an 5:118) that "the absence of forgiveness for *shirk* is a consequence of His threat, but it is not intrinsically impossible." Allah knows best the truth.

The humble Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (may he be pardoned) wrote this.

A review of the endorsements of the '*Ulama* of Al-Makkah al-Mukarramah, Allah increase its honour:

"All praise to the One Who is deserving of it, and from Him extends all help and guidance. That which 'Allamah Rashid Ahmad said in reply as cited [above] is the truth from which there is no escape. Allah send blessings and peace on the Seal of the Ambiya, his family and his companions."

The servant of the Shari'ah, seeking grace, Muhammad Salih ibn al-Marhum Siddiq Kamal al-Hanafi (Allah support them), the present Mufti of Makkah al-Mukarramah, ordered his signature.
The one hopeful of perfect attainment from His Rabb, Muhammad Sa'id ibn Muhammad Babusayl at Makkah (Allah forgive him and his parents, and his teachers and all the Muslims) signed it.
Seeking pardon from the Giver of Bestowals, Muhammad 'Abid ibn al-Marhum Shaykh Husayn, Mufti of the Malikis at the protected land of Allah, [signed it].
"[After] sending blessings and peace, that which 'Allamah Rashid Ahmad gave in answer is sufficient and upon it is reliance, rather it is the truth from which there is no escape."
Written by the humble one, Khulf ibn Ibrahim, a servant of *Ifta* for Hanbalis, at the honoured City of Makkah.

The response to what al-Barelwi said that he has in his possession a copy of the fatwa of the deceased *shaykh* in photocopy form containing what he mentioned, it is from his fabrications which he invented and kept with himself to slander the *shaykh* (May Allah sanctify his soul). Such lies and slanders are insignificant for him, for he is the teacher of teachers in this and all of them [i.e. liars] are children in comparison to him in his time. Indeed he is a distorting manipulator and a scheming imposter, often forging signatures. He is not less than the Masih al-Qadiyani, since the latter

claims Nubuwwat manifestly and openly, and the former conceals [claims of] revivalism, and anathematises (*yukaffiru*) the 'Ulama of the ummah, just as the Wahhabis, the followers of Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, anathematise the Ummah (May Allah Most High disgrace him as He disgraces them).

Question Twenty Four:

Do you believe in the possibility of the occurrence of falsehood in a speech from the Speech of the Master (Great and Glorious is His Majesty). If not, what then is your opinion?

Answer:

We and our elders (Allah Most High have mercy on them) declare and are convinced that all speech that issued from the Creator (Great and Glorious is He) or will issue from Him is absolutely truthful, and it is certain that it concurs with reality. Undoubtedly, there is no trace of falsehood in any part of His (Exalted is He) Speech, nor any doubt about [the absence of] contravening reality [in His Speech]. Whoever believes contrary to this or conceives of a lie in any part of His Speech, is a disbeliever, apostate and heretic, and does not have even a trace of faith.

Question Twenty Five:

Have you ascribed the view of "*imkaanul kizb*" (the possibility of lying) to some of the Ash'aris? If so,

what is meant by this? And do you have textual proof for this view from the reliable scholars? Explain the matter to us.

Answer:

This began as a dispute between us and the Indian logicians and innovators about the capacity of the Maker (Glorious is He) to act contrary to what He promised, informed, intended, and so on. They said that acting contrary to these things is absent from Allah’s Eternal Power (*qudrah qadimah*), rationally impossible (*mustahil aqlan*), impossible to exist within His capacity, and it is necessary for Him [to act] in accordance with His promise, report, intent and knowledge. We said: such things are certainly capacitated, but their occurrence (*wuqu’*) is not possible, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama’ah from the Ash’aris and Maturidis, textually and logically according to the Maturidis, and only textually according to the Ash’aris.

They objected that if the occurrence of these things were possible, it would entail the possibility of falsehood and this is certainly not in His capacity and is intrinsically impossible (*mustahil dhatan*). We responded using a variety of answers from the theologians, of which was: even if the concomitance of the possibility of falsehood in acting contrary to the promise, reports and so on, in His capacity is accepted, it too is not intrinsically impossible, rather, like oppression and impudence,

it is intrinsically and rationally possible, but it is textually and logically impossible, or just textually, as more than one of the Imams have espoused.
When they saw these responses they caused corruption in the land and attributed to us [the position of] allowing imperfections (*naqs*) in relation to His Holiness (Blessed and Exalted is He), and they spread this accusation amongst the foolish and the ignorant to create enmity in the common people and to seek enjoyment and popularity amongst men. They reached the pathways of the heavens in fabrication when they forged an imagination expressing the actuality (*fi'liyyah*) of falsehood without fearing the Knowing King. When Indians became aware of their scheming, they (i.e. the Bid'atis) sought help from the noble 'Ulama of the two Sanctuaries because they know they are unaware of their evils and the reality of the views of our 'Ulama.

Their likeness is but the likeness of the Mu'tazilah as compared with the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah, since they [i.e. the Mu'tazilah] excluded rewarding the sinner (*ithabat al-'asi*) and punishing the obedient (*'iqab al-muti'*) by the Eternal Power and made justice (*'adl*) necessary *(i.e. obligatory – such an obligation from which He has no power to depart – Mujlisul Ulama)* for Allah's essence (Zaat). They called themselves "the advocates of justice and transcendence" and they attributed injustice, unconscientiousness and ugliness to the *'Ulama* of Ahl al-Sunna wa al-Jama'ah. So, just as the

predecessors of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah did not mind their ignorance and did not permit incapacity in relation to Him (Azza Wa jal) in the aforementioned injustice, and broadened the Eternal Power while also removing imperfections from His Noble Absolute Self and perfecting the transcendence and sanctity of His Lofty Holiness, saying that, "Your understanding of the possibility of the capacity to punish the obedient and reward the sinner as an imperfection, is but the consequence of [following] the wretched philosophers". In the same way, we say to them, "Your understanding of the ability to act contrary to the promise, report and truth and the likes of them, as an imperfection, although their issuance (*sudur*) from Him (Exalted is He) is impossible, only textually, or rationally and textually, is but the misfortune of philosophy and logic and your incorrigible ignorance."

They do what they do because of the absolute transcendence [of Allah], but they are unable to perfect the Power and broaden it. As for our predecessors, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah, they combined between the two matters, of widening the Power and perfecting transcendence for the Eternal Being (Azza Wa Jal).

This is what we mentioned in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* in summary-form, and here are some of the proof-texts in support of it from the authoritative books of the Math-hab:

(1) It says in *Sharh al-Mawaqif*:

“All the Mu’tazilites and Kharijites make punishing the one who incurs a major sin necessary when he dies without repentance, *(i.e. Allah Ta’ala lacks the power to forgive them – Nauthu billaah!)* They do not allow Allah to pardon him for two reasons:

“First, He (Exalted is He) made it a promise to punish major sins and informed us of this i.e. punishment for major sins, hence if He does not punish for a major sin and pardons, it would entail reneging on His threat and imply falsehood in His speech, and this is impossible.

The answer for this is: the conclusion of this argument is that punishment is a future event. Thus, it is not an intrinsic issue whose existence is (intrinsically) necessary. This is the issue on which is our discussion. Since punishment is not an intrinsic/inherent issue, its non-occurrence does not entail reneging and falsehood? Punishment is from the possibilities which are included in His (Exalted is He) Power?” End [quote from *Sharh al-Mawaqif*]

(2) In *Sharh al-Maqasid* by ‘Allamah al-Taftazani (Rahmatullah alayh) at the end of the discussion on Power (Qudrat of Allah Ta’ala), he says:

“The deniers of the inclusiveness of His Power are many groups; of them are al-Nazzam and his [Mu'tazilite] followers who say that He does not have power over ignorance, falsehood and

oppression and all ugly acts (*qaba'ih*), for if their creation were in His capacity, their issuance (*sudur*) from Him would be possible, and this concomitant (*lazim*) is false because it results in impudence (*safah*) if He knows the ugliness of this and its dispensability, and in ignorance if He is not knowing. The response is: we do not concede the ugliness of a thing in relation to Him, how [can we accept this] when He is in complete control of His kingdom? And if it [i.e. ugliness in relation to Him] is conceded, Power over it does not negate the impossibility of its issuance from Him, by consideration of the presence of disposal and the absence of need, even if it is possible (*mumkinan*)." End [quote from *Sharh al-Maqasid*], in summary-form.

(3) It says in *al-Musayarah* and its commentary *Al-Musamarah* by 'Allamah al-Muhaqqiq Kamal ibn al-Humaam al-Hanafi and his student Ibn Abi l-Sharif al-Maqdisi al-Shafi'i (Rahmatullah alayhima):

"Then he i.e. the author of *al-'Umdah* said, 'Allah Azza Wa Jal is not attributed with Power over oppression, impudence and falsehood because the impossible is not included in [His] Power (Qudrat), i.e. it is improper for it (His Power) to be related to these issues (of injustice and deficiency). According to the Mu'tazilah, He (Exalted is He) is able over all that but does act accordingly.' End of quote from *al-'Umdah*.

"It appears as though he altered that which he transmitted from the Mu'tazilah, since there is no doubt that the absence of power over what was mentioned, is the position of the Mu'tazilah. As for its presence, i.e. power over what was mentioned, and abstention therefrom by volitional choice, is the stance of the Math-hab, i.e. it is, in fact, the Math-hab of the Ash'aris. It is not the view of the school of the Mu'tazilah. It is obvious that this more befitting position (of the Ash'aris) is also included in divine transcendence, since there is no doubt that abstention therefrom i.e. from oppression, impudence and falsehood, is an issue pertaining to divine transcendence, which does not befit the majesty of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

"Hence, the intellect understands which of the two views is more loftier and distinguished from indecencies: is it power over it, i.e. over oppression, impudence and falsehood what was mentioned from the three matters, along with impossibility by volitional choice, or its impossibility due to Him lacking power over it? Reliance on the former position is incumbent, and this is the view of the Ash'ari School." End [quote from *al-Musamarah*].

(4) In *Hawashi al-Kalnabwi 'ala Sharh al-'Aqa'id al-Adudiyyah* by al-Muhaqqiq al-Dawwani (Rahmatullah alayh) it is mentioned:

"In sum, lying being ugly in the Divine Speech (*al-kalam al-lafzi*), in the sense that it is an attribute of

deficiency, is prohibited according to the Ash'aris. That is why al-Sharif al-Muhaqqiq (al-Jurjani) said it is from the totality of the possibilities (*mumkinat*), and its non-occurrence in His speech is by consensus of the ulama and the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam). This does not negate its intrinsic possibility like all decisive knowledge of normal occurrences (*al-'ulum al-'adiya*) and it does not negate what Imam al-Razi said," in this regard.

(5) In *Tahrir al-Usul* by the author of *Fath al-Qadir*, Imam Ibn al-Humaam, and its commentary by Ibn Amir al-Hajj (Rahmatullah alayhima) they said:

"Therefore – i.e. since whatever is conceived as a deficiency is impossible for Him – the decisiveness of the impossibility of attributing Him – i.e. Allah Azza Wa Jal – with lying and the like of it (Glory to Him! High is He above it!) becomes apparent. Also, if the attribution of ugliness to His actions was possible, confidence in the integrity of His promise, the integrity of His speech besides it – i.e. [besides] His (Exalted is He) promise – and the integrity of His Ambiya would disappear – i.e. in principle, His integrity would be uncertain.

"According to the Ash'aris, He (Exalted is He) is certainly not attributed with ugly acts, but they are not rationally impossible, like all of creation. This is just like all the sciences in which one of two opposites being the reality is certain, but the other is not impossible, if it were assumed that it is the reality; just like the certainty of Mecca and Baghdad

– i.e. their existence – since their non-existence is not rationally impossible. Therefore – i.e. when the matter is such – confidence [in the integrity of His Word] disappearing is not necessitated because the rational possibility does not necessitate the absence of a firm resolution of its (practical) non-existence.

"The dispute regarding the rational impossibility and possibility applies to all deficiencies – does Allah have power over it or not? He will certainly not give practical effect to it despite the Qudrat. The absolutely decisive condition is that the deficiency will not be performed".

Similar views to what we have cited from the School of the Ash'aris were mentioned by al-Qadi al-'Adud in *Sharh Mukhtasar al-Usul* and the commentators on it. Similar statements are found in *Sharh al-Mawaqif* and the marginalia of *al-Mawaqif* by al-Chalabi, and others. Similarly, 'Allamah al-Qushji in *Sharh al-Tajrid*, al-Qunawi and others stated this. We avoided quoting their texts fearing prolixity and tedium. Allah has the power of guidance and direction.

(*Al-Muhannad 'ala l-Mufannad ya'ni 'Aqa'id 'Ulama Ahl al-Sunnah Deoband*, Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri, Idarat Islamiyyat, 1984, pp. 70-84)

Appendix D:
BY MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.

Much of the aforegoing elaboration will be incomprehensible to laymen due to its academic nature. Firstly the questions in dispute are subtle. Secondly, the arguments and evidences are largely based on the principles of logic. Thirdly technical terms have been literally translated. This combination creates a scenario of *obscurum per obscurious*, i.e. explaining the obscure with what is more obscure. We shall, therefore present a simple explanation for better comprehension.

THE QUESTION OF IMKAAN-E-KITHB

Literally, *Imkaan-e-Kithb* means the *possibility of speaking a lie.* The Qabar Pujaaris grabbed the literal meaning and with it slandered the Ulama of Deoband, accusing them of believing and stating that 'Allah Ta'ala speaks lies' - Nauthubillah!

The term *imkaan* in the context has a technical meaning which means *rational possibility,* not practical possibility. A rational possibility is valid and intellectually possible without it necessarily being in practical existence. For example, it is possible to imagine in the mind a donkey with a hundred heads although such an animal does not exist. The existence in the intellect is termed *rational*

possibility (Imkaan-e-Aqli) which is the meaning of *imkaan* in the context.
On the other hand *rational impossibility (Mahaal-e-Aqli)* refers to an entity which is rationally impossible, hence it will also be practically impossible. For example, it cannot be rationally conceived that one plus one equal three, or something can be black and white in the same substratum at the very same time, or it can be day and night at the very same time.

While the issue in dispute pertains to the domain of *rational possibility* in the technical meaning, the grave-worshippers accused the Ulama of Deoband with the slander of believing in the practical possibility or the real possibility of Allah Azza Wa Jal acting in contradiction to His Promises, e.g. forgiving Shaitaan, Fir'oun and the like, and granting them admission to Jannat.

The subtlety of the issue has confused the ordinary folk who fell into the snare of slander woven by the Qabar Pujaari molvis. However, Ulama and intelligent Muslims understand that at no stage did the Ulama of Deoband put forth the kufr of practical attribution of falsehood to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The simple issue is only this: Does Allah Ta'ala have the power (Qudrat) to forgive the incorrigible kuffaar such as Shaitaan, Fir'oun, Haamaan, etc.? It is the belief of the heretical philosophers (those

who had sprung up among Muslims) and of the Mu'tazili heretical sect that Allah Ta'ala lacks the power to forgive these kuffaar. In other words even if he wanted to send them to Jannat, He is bereft of the power to do so – Nauthubillah.

The contention of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah since the inception of Islam, has always been that Allah Ta'ala does possess the Qudrat although He will not act in conflict with His eternal Promise. The Qabar Pujaaris incline to the Mu'tazili viewpoint. Instead of honestly stating their case, they resort to slandering the Ulama of the Ahlus Sunnah Wa'l Jama'ah. The Kutub of the Ulama of the Ahlus Sunnah state exactly the same view propounded by the Ulama of Deoband on this question. Thus, Hadhrat Maulana Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) and the Ulama of Deoband in general, did not proffer any new concept. They simply narrated the official and authoritative view of the Ahlus Sunnah and expounded it for better comprehension.

It is inconceivable to an intellect functioning in the state of equilibrium to accept that Allah Ta'ala lacks the power to pardon Shaitaan. No one had ever claimed that Allah Ta'ala will forgive Shaitaan and admit him to Jannat. But, if Allah Azza Wa Jal chooses to bestow *hidaayat* to Shaitaan, what power in creation can prevent Him from this simple act? The Qur'aan Majeed is replete with the declaration: *"He guides whomever He wills, and He*

misguides whomever He wills." In the Qur'aan Majeed Allah Azza Wa Jal states:

"Thus, We have made for every Nabi enemies from from mankind and the shayaateen. They inspire one another with adorned statements of deception. ***And, if your Rabbwills, they would not be able to do so.*** *Therefore leave them and that (evil) which they fabricate." (Al-An'aam, aayat 112)*

If Allah Ta'ala so desires that these human and jinn devils acquire *hidaayat,* nothing can prevent it. Thus, the aayat establishes with certitude the rational possibility of the shayaateen acquiring *hidaayat (guidance).* Comprehending this simple reality is within the intellectual parameters of even rustic and illiterate folk. There is nothing rationally possible which is impossible for Allah Azza Wa Jal. He repeatedly declares in His Qur'aan-e-Hakeem:

"Verily, Allah has power over all things."

Now from whence do these moron grave-worshippers hail to curb and truncate the infinite, eternal *Qudrat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal?

Further confirming the unrestricted *Qudrat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

"(O Muhammad!) Recite to them the episode of the one to whom We gave Our Aayaat. Then he abandoned it. Thus, Shaitaan pursued him (to enlist

and entangle him in evil). Then he became of those who had gone astray.

If We had willed, We could have elevated him with those Verses, But he (the vile one) clung to the earth and followed his base desires. Thus, his example is like that of a dog."
(Al-A'raaf, Verses 175 & 176)

The episode mentioned in these Verses pertains to a very pious Buzrug (Saint) of bygone times¸prior to the advent of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He fell into the trap of shaitaan and abandoned the Haqq and went astray into kufr and evil. Regarding him, Allah Ta'ala says: *"If We had desired",* he would not have gone astray, and he would have been among those of elevated ranks. This establishes the fact that although this person, like Shaitaan, Fir'oun, etc. have been decreed for everlasting doom, Allah Ta'ala has the power to act to the contrary and forgive them. This is the meaning of *Imkaan-e-Kithb – the rational possibility of an issue which will not attain practicality by Allah's choice.*

Another pertinent question coming within the purview of this self-same issue, is the possibility of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being punished by Allah Ta'ala. What is the *tafseer* of this possibility, and what type of possibility is it? Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself elucidated this issue to preclude the assertions of

the grave-worshippers bogged in *jahl-e-murakkab (compound ignorance).* The Qur'aan-e-Hakeem states:

"It is not proper for a Nabi to take prisoners until he spills blood
In the land. Do you desire the material things of this world whilst Allah desires (for you) the Aakhirat. Allah is The Mighty, The Wise.

If it had not been for a decree preordained, then most certainly, a great punishment would have afflicted you on account of what you had taken."
(Al-Anfaal, Verses 67 & 68)

On the occasion of the Battle of Badr, 70 prisoners were taken. What had to be done with these prisoners? There were two opinions: One – to ransom them, and two- to put them to death. The former advice was proffered by Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) and other Sahaabah, while Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was of the latter view.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), being *Rahmatullahi lil Aalameen (A Mercy to the worlds),* opted for the advice of Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu), and the prisoners were ransomed and set free. It was on this occasion that these two Verses were revealed with the severe reprimand for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The day after this incident, when Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) went to visit Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he was shocked to see Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) bitterly weeping. Overcome with emotion, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) said:

"O Rasulullah! Why are you and your Companion weeping so much? If I am informed of the reason, I too shall weep, and if I am unable to weep, I shall simulate a weeping person so as to be like you."

Rasulullah (sallallaahu alayhi wasallam) responded: *"I am weeping because I perceived the arrival of the punishment of Allah as close as the nearest side of the tree because I had accepted the opinion of those who had suggested the ransom." (Ma-aalimaat Tanzeel)*

In another Aayat, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is commanded by Allah Ta'ala to say:

"Say (O Muhammad!): 'Verily I fear the punishment of the Great Day if I disobey my Rabb." (Aayat 7, An'aam)

Now the Qabar Pujaaris may proclaim us to be *'kaafir'* on the basis of the slander that we believe that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will be

punished by Allah Ta'ala. This episode comes within the scope of the meaning of *Imkaan-e-Kithb.*

While there are numerous such examples in the Qur'aan Majeed of Allah's unrestricted, eternal Power, we shall cite one more for people of intelligence. Allah Ta'ala states:

"If your Rabb had willed then most certainly all on earth, all of them would have believed."
(Yoonus, Aayat 99)

Only unfortunate and miserable ones can claim that Allah Ta'ala lacks the power to forgive, guide and admit to Jannat Shaitaan, Fir'oun, Haamaan, Qaaroon, Namrood, etc., etc. This fact is a rational possibility. However, by His volitional Will, Allah Ta'ala will not forgive them. Abstention from forgiveness is not the effect of inability or lack of power. It is indeed kufr to believe that Allah Ta'ala lacks the *Qudrat* to do as He pleases.

Further confirming the unfettered *Qudrat of Allah Ta'ala to do as He pleases, the Qur'aan Majeed states:*

"So that Allah may reward the Saadiqeen (the Truthful ones) for their truth, and punish the Munaafiqeen (the hypocrites) ***if He wills or forgives them.*** *Verily Allah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."*
(Ahzaab, Aayat 24)

This in a nutshell is the stupid and evil controversy which the Qabar Pujaaris have churned up on the issue of *Imkaan-e-Kithb.*

Appendix E:
BY MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.

THE QUESTION OF AALIMUL GHAIB

On this issue too, the Qabar Pujaaris have kicked up considerable dust with their slandering. *Ghaib* in the context of the Qur'aan refers to unseen/unknown knowledge and issues, the awareness of which is possible only by revelation/inspiration from Allah Azza Wa Jal. Jannat, Jahannam, the Malaaikah, Looh Mahfuz, the torments of the Grave and innumerable other matters are from the *Ghaib.*

The stance of the Ulama-e-Haqq of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah is that only Allah Azza Wa Jal is *Aalimul Ghaib (the Knower of the Ghaib).* No created being is intrinsically *Aalimul Ghaib.* Whatever knowledge of the *Ghaib* the Ambiya had was a bestowal of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Their knowledge of the *Ghaib* was not independent of Allah Ta'ala.

In refutation of the Qabar Pujaari's belief that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *Aalimul Ghaib,* the question was posed: Is Nabi (Salallahu alayhi wasallam) the knower of ***all*** *Ghaib ad infinitum,* or of a portion of the *Ghaib* i.e. of some issues of the realm of *Ghaib.*

Rationally and narrationally the first possibility is precluded. It is not at all possible because no one besides Allah Azza Wa Jal has all-embracing, infinite Knowledge of the Ghaib. The self-evident reality of this fact obviates the need to cite some examples of this fact from the million examples in the Qur'aan and Ahaadith to prove that only Allah Azza Wa Jal is the Sole Repository of all-embracing and total Knowledge of the *Ghaib.*

If it is said that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had a portion of the knowledge of the *Ghaib,* then this option too is baseless because the knowledge revealed to him ceases to be *Ghaib* after its revelation and publication, hence all the members of the Ummah are aware of Jannat, Jahannam, Siraat, Barzakh, etc., etc. Hence, each and every person in the Ummah be he a faajir and a faasiq will also be described as *Aalimul Ghaib***.** But this is manifestly baatil (baseless and false).

Secondly, this knowledge of the *Ghaib* possessed by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not independent of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is knowledge

imparted to the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) by Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is therefore, manifestly incorrect and improper to ascribe the title, *Aalimul Ghaib* to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Thirdly, awarding this title to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without any Shar'i *daleel* is baseless and an excess committed in the Deen.

Fourthly, the *Aqeedah (Belief)* of the masses is corrupted and brings them within the fold of *shirk.* It, i.e. conferring this title to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), is *shirk* because an attribute which is exclusive with Allah Ta'ala is being awarded to a created being. The ignorant and unwary masses will believe from this title that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the Knower of the *Ghaib* in its intrinsic, unrestricted, infinite meaning.

Finally and firmly clinching this argument in negation of the claims of the Grave-Worshippers, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

"Say (to them): 'I do not say to you that by me are the Treasures of Allah ***nor (do I say that) I know the ghaib,*** *Nor do I say to you that I am an Angel. I follow merely what is being revealed to me."*
(Al-An'aam, Aayat 5o)

"By Him are the keys of the ***Ghaib. No one knows of it, except He.****" (Al-An'aam, Aayat 59)*

*"**He (Allah) is Aalimul Ghaib** wash-Shahaadah, and He is The Knower, The One Who is Aware."*
(Al-An'Aam, Aayat 73)

*"Say (O Muhammad!): 'I am not able of either benefit or harm for myself. **If I was aware of the Ghaib,** then I would have ensured abundance of goodness (for myself), and hardship would not have afflicted me. I am merely a warner and a bringer of glad tidings for a people who believe."*
(Al-A'raaf, Aayat 188)
*"(O Muhammad!) Say: '**Verily the Ghaib belongs to only Allah,** therefore wait (for His punishment)."*
(Yoonus, Aayat 20)

*"These are from the **episodes of the Ghaib which We reveal to you (O Muhammad!). You were formerly not aware of it,** neither you nor your nation." (Hood, Aayat 49)*

*"(O Muhammad!) Say: **'None in the heavens and the earth is aware of the Ghaib except Allah…**"*

*"Verily, Allah is **Aalimul Ghaib of the heavens and the earth,** Verily, He aware what is within the breasts (of people)." (Faatir, Aayat 38)*

"He (Allah) is Aalimul Ghaib. He does not inform anyone of His Ghaib except for the Rasool with whom He is pleased…"

(Al-Jinn, Aayat 27)

"Haqq has come and baatil has perished, for verily baatil (by its very) nature perishes." (Qur'aan)

There is no need to further pursue this manifestly obvious stupid controversy created by the Qabar Pujaaris.